| 1  | IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT   |  |
|----|---|--|
| 2  | FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO  |  |
| 3  |   |  |
| 4  | UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,   |  |
| 5  | Plaintiff,  |  |
| 6  | vs. 14-CV-1025-RB-SMV   |  |
| 7  | THE CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE,  |  |
| 8  | Defendant.  |  |
| 9  | VS.   |  |
| 10 | THE ALBUQUERQUE POLICE  |  |
| 11 | OFFICERS' ASSOCIATION,  |  |
| 12 | Intervenor.   |  |
| 13 |   |  |
| 14 | TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS   |  |
| 15 | STATUS CONFERENCE<br>BEFORE THE HONORABLE ROBERT C. BRACK                   |  |
| 16 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE THURSDAY, MARCH 15, 2018, 1:30 P.M.            |  |
| 17 | ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO   |  |
| 18 |   |  |
| 19 | Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography,                             |  |
| 20 | transcript produced by computer.  |  |
| 21 |   |  |
| 22 | Reported by:  |  |
| 23 | JULIE GOEHL, RDR, CRR, RPR, RMR, NM CCR #95<br>United States Court Reporter |  |
| 24 | 333 Lomas Boulevard, Northwest<br>Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102             |  |
| 25 | Phone: (505)348-2209 Email: Julie_Goehl@nmcourt.fed.us                      |  |

| 1  | APPEARANCES  |
|----|--|
| 2  | FOR THE UNITED STATES:   |
| 3  | UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE  |
| 4  | District of New Mexico<br>201 Third Street, Northwest                                      |
| 5  | Suite 900<br>Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102   |
| 6  | BY: MR. JOHN C. ANDERSON, UNITED STATES ATTORNEY MS. ELIZABETH M. MARTINEZ, EXECUTIVE AUSA |
| 7  | AND  |
| 8  | UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  |
| 9  | Civil Rights Division 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, Northwest                                   |
| 10 | Washington, D.C. 20005 BY: MR. PAUL KILLEBREW, ESQ.  |
| 11 | MS. SARAH LOPEZ, ESQ.  |
| 12 |  |
| 13 | FOR THE CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE:   |
| 14 | CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE<br>One Civic Plaza, Northwest                                       |
| 15 | Fourth Floor Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102   |
| 16 | BY: MR. ESTEBAN AGUILAR, JR., CITY ATTORNEY MR. JERAMY SCHMEHL, ESQ.                       |
| 17 | MR. JERAMI SCHMEHL, ESQ.   |
| 18 |  |
| 19 | FOR THE INTERVENOR APOA:   |
| 20 | SANCHEZ, MOWRER & DESIDERIO, P.C.<br>Attorneys at Law                                      |
| 21 | Post Office Box 1966 Albuquerque, New Mexico 87103   |
| 22 | BY: MR. FREDERICK M. MOWRER, ESQ.  |
| 23 |  |
| 24 |  |
| 25 |  |

| 1  | APPEARANCES (Continued)   |
|----|---|
| 2  | ALSO PRESENT:   |
| 3  | DR. JAMES D. GINGER, INDEPENDENT MONITOR MS. LAURIE OWENS, DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONS |
| 4  | MR. DANIEL GIAQUINTO, DEPUTY MONITOR MR. LORENZO GARCIA, SPECIAL CONSULTANT       |
| 5  | MS. ALYSSA FERDA, USAO OUTREACH COORDINATOR                                       |
| 6  | MR. MICHAEL J. GEIER, CHIEF, APD MR. ERIC GARCIA, DEPUTY CHIEF, APD               |
| 7  | MR. HAROLD MEDINA, DEPUTY CHIEF, APD MS. CORI LOWE, COMPLIANCE BUREAU             |
| 8  | MR. TIM KELLER, MAYOR MS. SARITA NAIR, CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER               |
| 9  | MR. SEAN WILLOUGHBY, PRESIDENT, APOA MR. JUSTIN MONTGOMERY, VICE-PRESIDENT, APOA  |
| 10 | MR. JAMES LEWIS, SENIOR ADVISOR FOR PUBLIC SAFETY MR. PETER CUBRA, ESQ.           |
| 11 | MR. ALFRED MATHEWSON, ESQ. MR. ANTONIO MAESTAS, ESQ. MR. RALPH ARELLANES          |
| 12 | MS. MARIA BAUTISTA MR. EDWARD HARNESS, CPOA EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR                    |
| 13 | MS. NANCY KOENIGSBERG, ESQ.   |
| 14 | MR. STEVEN ALLEN MR. CHRIS SYLVAN MR. ROD KONTNY                                  |
| 15 | MS. DOROTHY WOODWARD MR. DANNY WHATLEY  |
| 16 | DR. BILL KASS MS. CHELSEA VAN DEVENTER  |
| 17 | MS. CHEESEA VAN DEVENTER  |
| 18 | TELEPHONIC APPEARANCE: DIONNA K. FORD, Law Clerk                                  |
| 19 |   |
| 20 |   |
| 21 |   |
| 22 |   |
| 23 |   |
| 24 |   |
| 25 |   |

## STATUS CONFERENCE

(Court in session at 1:30 p.m.)

2.0

2.4

COURTROOM DEPUTY JESSICA CHAVEZ: All rise.

United States District Court is now in session, the Honorable Robert C. Brack presiding. God save these United States and this Honorable Court.

THE COURT: Thanks, everyone. Good afternoon. Take your seats, please.

This is United States of America v. The City of Albuquerque, and The Albuquerque Police Officers'
Association as intervenor.

We're here this afternoon for a status conference, and rather than my going around the tables and trying to figure out who all is here, why don't I just have you announce your appearances, please.

Perhaps we can begin with the new U.S. Attorney.

MR. JOHN C. ANDERSON: Thank you, Your Honor. John Anderson, United States Attorney, on behalf of the United States.

THE COURT: Yes, sir. Thank you.

MS. ELIZABETH MARTINEZ: Elizabeth Martinez on behalf of the United States. And we're joined with our assistant, Alyssa Ferda.

MR. PAUL KILLEBREW: Paul Killebrew on behalf of the United States. Also sitting at counsel table is

Sarah Lopez, an investigator in my office. 1 2 MR. FREDERICK MOWRER: May it please the Court. Frederick Mowrer on behalf of the Albuquerque 3 Police Officers' Association, along with President Sean 4 Willoughby and Vice-President Justin Montgomery. 5 6 THE COURT: Thanks very much. 7 MR. ESTEBAN AGUILAR, JR.: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Esteban Aguilar, Jr., on behalf of the City 8 9 of Albuquerque. With me is co-counsel Jeramy Schmehl. 10 And with the Court's permission, I would like the 11 attendees here on behalf of the City to introduce 12 themselves as well. 13 THE COURT: Please. MR. ESTEBAN AGUILAR, JR.: Thank you, Your 14 15 Honor. 16 MR. JAMES LEWIS: Your Honor, James Lewis, 17 Monitor, on behalf of APD and the City of Albuquerque. THE COURT: Thank you. 18 19 MR. ERIC GARCIA: Your Honor, Deputy Chief 2.0 Eric Garcia from APD. 21 MS. CORI LOWE: Your Honor, Cori Lowe, 22 lieutenant with APD. 23 MS. SARITA NAIR: Your Honor, Sarita Nair, 2.4 Chief Administrative Officer. 25 MR. TIM KELLER: Your Honor, Tim Keller,

1 Mayor of Albuquerque. 2 THE COURT: Yes, sir. Thank you. And we've got Judge Garcia, who is here as 3 well. 4 THE HONORABLE LORENZO GARCIA: Yes, special 5 consultant for the City of Albuquerque, Lorenzo Garcia. 6 7 THE COURT: Thank you. MS. LAURIE OWENS: Your Honor, Laurie Owens 8 with the Monitoring Team. 9 10 MR. DANIEL GIAQUINTO: Good afternoon, Your 11 Honor. Daniel Giaquinto, Deputy Monitor, Independent 12 Monitoring Team. 13 THE COURT: Thank you. 14 DR. JAMES GINGER: Good afternoon, Your 15 Honor. James Ginger with the Monitoring Team. 16 THE COURT: Thank you very much. I think 17 that's the last of the introductions. I know that we 18 have representatives from the amici here, and I think 19 we'll hear from them in turn this afternoon, and look 2.0 forward to you introducing yourself at that time. 21 The parties have proposed an agenda for 22 today's status conference, and the first item is introduction of the new leadership, the U.S. Attorney. 23 2.4 Well, Ms. Martinez, you were going to

25

introduce Mr. Anderson.

MS. ELIZABETH MARTINEZ: Good afternoon, Your Honor. I would like to take this opportunity to bring the Court and the community up to date on some changes to the Department of Justice team that is representing the United States.

2.0

2.4

First I would like to alert the Court and the community that Luis Saucedo, who has been a member of the DOJ team, is not going to be a part of our team going forward. As the Court has been aware, Mr. Saucedo has been representing the United States both in this case and in our constitutional policing case in Puerto Rico. As many in our community are aware, Puerto Rico has been experiencing some pretty challenging conditions, particularly in the aftermath of two catastrophic hurricanes, and Mr. Saucedo is at this point required to dedicate virtually all of his time to the police practices case in Puerto Rico.

We do, however, want to reassure the Court and our community that the Department of Justice, both at the Civil Rights Division and here at the U.S.

Attorney's Office, remain fully committed to fully and completely following through with the constitutional policing case here in Albuquerque.

I would at this time like to introduce to you and to our community our new U.S. Attorney, and I do

that with great pleasure. As you know, Judge, John Anderson is no stranger to this Court or to the U.S. Attorney's Office. He was an Assistant U.S. Attorney in our office from 2008 to 2013, where he was in our Criminal Division. He was in our office when our office began investigating the Albuquerque Police Department. And, as this Court is aware, he clerked for Judge Kelly at the Tenth Circuit in Santa Fe. And, of course, he practiced before you and other judges of this Court while he was an AUSA, and he continued to appear before you and other judges of this Court when he was in private practice after he left our office.

2.0

2.4

Mr. Anderson will speak to you and to our community about his commitment to this important reform process as U.S. Attorney and as the head of our office.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Anderson, please come forward. Congratulations on your appointment.

We met recently and talked about things just generally. I'm glad to have you on board.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$  JOHN C. ANDERSON: Thank you, Your Honor. May it please the Court.

It's a privilege to be here for this status conference today and to represent the United States in furtherance of this important reform effort. I do want to thank the Court. I know it has put in many hours and

efforts to move this matter forward. I would also like to thank the City, the community, stakeholders, and the amici for being here for this important conference, and for all of their work in this matter that is crucial to the health and safety of our community.

2.0

2.4

I do want to assure the Court and all the community stakeholders and amici of my commitment to moving this important effort forward. I know that all the parties, including the City, have put in many hours of work in hopes of achieving this reform that will undoubtedly make our community a healthier and safer place to live. And so I thank you all for being here, and again I do thank the Court, and I look forward to working with the Court and all the parties as we make further progress in this matter, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you. And congratulations once again on your appointment to U.S. Attorney.

MR. JOHN C. ANDERSON: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Schmehl, you were going to make an introduction, as well.

MR. JERAMY SCHMEHL: Your Honor, may it please the Court.

Mr. Aguilar is the newly appointed City
Attorney. He comes from private practice with a
background representing stakeholders in this very

1 system. He has a background in complex litigation, and 2 he has been practicing for over ten years. 3 I personally am excited to have him in the office two doors down from me. It has been empty for a 4 little bit longer than I would have liked. But I'm very 5 excited, as is the City. I won't belabor the point, and 6 7 I'll allow him to speak to the Court. And with that, I'll give you the new City 8 9 Attorney, Mr. Steve Aguilar. 10 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Schmehl. 11 Mr. Aguilar. 12 MR. ESTEBAN AGUILAR, JR.: Thank you, Your 13 Honor. THE COURT: And you may not recall, but I 14 15 have met you. 16 MR. ESTEBAN AGUILAR, JR.: Absolutely. 17 THE COURT: And your dad and I went to law 18 school together. 19 MR. ESTEBAN AGUILAR, JR.: That is absolutely 20 correct, Your Honor, and I do remember. 21 THE COURT: I'm glad to have you on board 22 with us. 23 MR. ESTEBAN AGUILAR, JR.: I'm excited to be 24 on board, Your Honor. May it please the Court. 25 Audience members, stakeholders, members of the

community, Your Honor, and of course the DOJ team.

2.0

2.4

Again, my name is Esteban Aguilar, Jr. -Steve, Your Honor, as you know. I am excited to have
the opportunity to become a part of this team and this
effort on behalf of the City of Albuquerque to reaffirm
our commitment to the reform process, not only to the
Court, but to the community, as well. I know that the
Mayor and Ms. Nair are going to speak more to that.

But I wanted to assure the Court that the City treats our responsibilities and our obligations under the agreement very seriously, and we are taking all efforts that we can to expedite the reform process and to make sure that it is done correctly, and that it is done efficiently, Your Honor.

And so that being said, I know we have a long day and so I don't want to take up more of the Court's time, but I appreciate the opportunity to work and appear before you here today, and I am looking forward to continuing to work with everybody here on behalf of the residents of the City of Albuquerque.

THE COURT: You're welcome.

MR. ESTEBAN AGUILAR, JR.: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I'm glad to have you as part of the team, as well.

MR. ESTEBAN AGUILAR, JR.: Thank you.

THE COURT: And say "Hi" to your dad.

MR. ESTEBAN AGUILAR, JR.: Thank you, Your

Honor. Thank you.

2.0

2.4

THE COURT: Mr. Mayor.

MR. TIM KELLER: Thank you, Your Honor, and members who are here today. I appreciate the opportunity to share a few words before we get started in earnest, and I believe this is at least the first time in quite some time that the Mayor has been able to be here and present, so I do want to just acknowledge that I'm grateful for that opportunity, and I think it's something, from time to time, that might be important for the City and the stakeholders.

Now, firstly, I want to say thank you for having it in this venue. I've always wanted to come in this courtroom, and I'm glad I've never had to come in here, but I've only seen it on TV where I saw you, which was that KUNM special. Actually, I was just really thrilled to be able to enjoy this special place, as well.

So let me also, I think, just reaffirm, since we haven't gathered in a formal way since our administration took office, that we are committed to not only complying with the CASA, but also to fully

institutionalizing constitutional policing in Albuquerque.

2.0

2.4

And I am very grateful to the DOJ, to Dr.

Ginger, to the APOA, and the other amici for giving our administration and the new command staff a little bit of extra time to get up to speed and make some urgent changes that we needed to make. Also, I am thankful to the Court for the associated extensions that have enabled us to do that.

Now, as Mayor, I want to share and reiterate that fundamentally, I believe the Mayor is ultimately responsible for at least the City's side of this process, and so I accept that responsibility. I ran on that responsibility, and I know that I will be in many ways judged by the people on how well or how well I did not do with respect to that responsibility. And I actually think that's the way it should be, and I think that's what's an important part of democracy in our city and leadership in our community.

Now, I want to share just a moment to catch up at least all the stakeholders on some of the changes that we've made, and sort of who's who, and roles and responsibilities, and then I'll just cut it short.

Number one, in December when I came in, the first order of business was to reorganize the Police

Department along a couple of lines. One was for effective crime fighting, which is something, obviously, that is sorely needed in our community. But also, effective compliance and cooperation with the DOJ process.

2.0

2.4

And so we'll leave these with the clerks, but I do have the before and after org charts, and I just want to highlight a couple of things. We now have a dedicated Compliance Bureau in APD that, of course, is headed by Deputy Chief Garcia, and that is essentially the job of that entire Bureau. And the fact that we have a Deputy Chief in charge who has been doing this before I think speaks to the seriousness and the level of priority that it needs to be.

We also have a new Chief of Police, who I know most folks have met, and he has done an outstanding job in terms of helping craft a structure and individuals for hiring that can actually deliver on this process.

Now, there are a couple other components to this. We just met our new City Attorney, who I think is an excellent fit for this role. We also have an individual by the name of James Lewis, who is here with us today. This is essentially the civilian counterpart to Deputy Chief Garcia, so he is basically the civilian charged with monitoring compliance -- lower case

"monitoring" -- for myself, for the City of Albuquerque, for the Mayor's Office, for the 11th floor, and for the CAO. And so we are very grateful to have James on board for that important role. And I won't go into his extensive bio, but there is a whole host of reasons why I think he's an excellent fit for that role.

2.0

2.4

I think, lastly, let me just talk about something a little bit more deeper in the community, but I think is very relevant.

We now have a full-time community policing coordinator, and that's a gentleman by the name of Chris Sylvan, who I think is here. Maybe he'll wave. Chris Sylvan in the back. This, again, is an area where I believe that we need an individual accountability, both in the org chart and in terms of an actual person who can actually facilitate community policing. And so we've essentially honored that notion with both a person and a full-time position.

And so those are some of the larger changes.

I won't go into the others as a whole, but just note
that to our knowledge, this is the largest restructuring
in APD's modern history, and primarily what was cut out
was the level of major, and we now have, I think, very
clear traditional bureaus and divisions in the
departments. And we also have a situation where we

still have some vacancies that we're working on, but a lot of those actually are in the compliance area.

2.0

2.4

And so we continue to put the right people in the right places, and that combination is what I also take personal interest and zeal in, in terms of making sure we've got the boxes right and the people right.

And I think so far, we've done a very good job of setting that up.

So I think with that, Your Honor, let me just reiterate our commitment to providing the resources that APD needs, as well, to continue these reforms, and that includes sworn officers, civilian personnel, and the technology that is associated with not only this process, which there is a strong technological component, but also with operating a modern, effective, crime-fighting Department. And fortunately, the Council has made some tough decisions in the last week that is going to enable us to actually do that.

So historically, I think there are three areas that we had to bring together as a City.

Number one, it takes an administration and a Mayor and a Police Department saying, "We are here to honor both the letter and the spirit of the CASA process." Number two, it takes people in the right places, in the right structure, to get things done. And

number three, we have to provide the resources that are needed so that we can actually adequately staff our Police Department.

2.0

2.4

That is going to be an ongoing process for us, but I think financially, we're in much better shape, and I appreciate the Council's vote with respect to dealing with that issue. But we actually have a chance to adequately resource our Police Department for the first time in a long time. And so we have to work on that over the next few years. It's not going to be a short process, but I think at least now we have the opportunity to have the kind of Police Department adequately resourced and the kind of reform process adequately resourced, that we haven't had in a long time.

And I'll close with this. I know on the front lines, use of force obviously is fundamental to this entire process. I was committed to bringing together the notion of building community trust, but also setting up a situation where our officers feel empowered to do the kind of work they need to do in an appropriate way and in that constitutional community policing manner that we're committed to. And I think we have made some excellent early progress on that, and I hope that's also going to help a lot of the issues that we're seeing on

the front line with our officers, as well.

So with that, Your Honor, again, I just want to say thank you. I know we have a long road to go on this, but I know we also want to make as much progress as we can, as fast as we can, and so somewhere in the middle of that I hope will be a successful journey with the DOJ process.

Thank you.

2.0

2.4

THE COURT: Mr. Mayor, of course, thank you for your remarks, and if you'll allow me just a minute to follow up on a couple of points that you made.

First of all, I love this courtroom, too.

Judge Parker is ever gracious. He says, "When you have to be in Albuquerque, Bob, call me first." And it so happens that he's over at Lomas today, doing sentencings, and so the courtroom was available, and I really do appreciate that because it's such a lovely courtroom. And a lot of people don't know it's here, a lot of people never have had a chance to see it. So there's that.

I don't think it would be out of school to say that when you hadn't been on board very long, you asked to have a tete-a-tete, a meeting, although factions were not represented. And I came from Las Cruces specifically for that purpose, and we met over at Lomas

in the courtroom, and just by way of introduction, for the most part. And I appreciated the chance to get to know you, had not known you before.

2.0

2.4

And as it came out at the time, I was on the fence about whether I was going to continue to oversee this process. It doesn't matter to anybody else, but I'm going senior status this summer, and with that gives me some leeway about the cases that I take and don't, and I had thought maybe I'd let somebody else enjoy all this fun.

And you said then what you've said very publicly just now. You ran on this issue. You're going to be judged on the success of this issue, among many of those other issues during your tenure. And you said, "I own this." And I said at that time, with that kind of commitment level from you personally to all of those that are present, I agreed to stay on. So you either get the credit or, depending on how people view it — you know, I'm still going to be hitched.

I attended a Consent Decree conference that was put together by Judge Morgan from New Orleans in the Eastern District of Louisiana. She has a Consent Decree ongoing there, and she thought a long time ago — she has been in that process since 2012 — that we need not reinvent wheels on our own, that we ought to be able

to -- and I think there are nine Decrees going on, from as far as Puerto Rico to Seattle.

2.0

2.4

So she has organized this conference. This is the second year; it's my first year to be able to attend. But Deputy Chief Garcia and Mr. Schmehl were both there on behalf of the City. I was pleased to see them. I was pleased to see that level of interest. And we can learn a lot from what has gone before us.

And we were introduced to the concept of a Compliance Bureau. Maybe you-all were onboard with all that beforehand. I hadn't heard about it until that time. And two young men got up, and they described themselves as geeks. That wasn't disparaging. They took that on themselves. And they talked about the need to be able to measure before you could mark improvement. And they had stood this thing up in New Orleans to a really great result.

And there is humor in the process. They looked like they were 14 years old, to me. But everybody looks like they're 14 years old, to me. But someone in the audience said at some point, "I've got a question for Harry Potter," one of the young geeks up there. And he didn't mean any offense, he said, and the guy said, "I don't take any offense. I cultivate that image. You know, we have the haircuts and the glasses

1 and the whole thing." 2 I'm really glad. I came home, talked to my 3 clerks about the Compliance Bureau sort of approach, and said, "I'm looking forward to talking to the City about 4 that." And within just a few days of that, I learned 5 6 that you-all were of the same mind. I'm pleased about 7 that. So thank you for your comments and your 8 9 commitment, and unless there's something else -- Ms. 10 Nair, were you --11 MS. SARITA NAIR: No, Your Honor, unless you 12 have questions for me. 13 THE COURT: No, thank you. 14 Thanks, Mr. Mayor. 15 MR. TIM KELLER: Thank you, Your Honor. 16 THE COURT: And you're always welcome at 17 these. Please feel free. 18 MR. TIM KELLER: Thank you. I appreciate you 19 sticking it out, too. 2.0 THE COURT: So, Mr. Killebrew, are you up 21

THE COURT: So, Mr. Killebrew, are you up next, Item 3 on the agenda, the joint stipulation suspending CASA Paragraph 308? I know what that means, but there are those here that may not.

22

23

2.4

25

And the fact is, Mr. Killebrew was there, too.

MR. PAUL KILLEBREW: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: In Ft. Worth, at the conference.

I'm glad to hear you now, please.

2.0

2.4

MR. PAUL KILLEBREW: Thank you so much, Your Honor. Thank you, as well, for indulging the parties, the amici, this community by coming to Albuquerque today for a public hearing that everyone could be present at.

The last time we were all together in November felt very different, and I think at that time we knew that we were on the precipice of big changes. I think what we're here today to say is that those changes are coming, and the filings I'm going to talk about today are the first stage of that. So there's going to be —also, because the Mayor brought it up, I wanted to just acknowledge that the staffing decisions that the Albuquerque Police Department and the City have made have been very positive. In November, I said that they were agents of change within the Albuquerque Police Department, and those agents of change are still there, and now they are the leaders of change within the Albuquerque Police Department.

So Deputy Chief Garcia is now in charge of that Compliance Bureau. He is the one who is managing the entire change process within the agency. We view that as a very positive decision by the City.

There's also a commander, John Sullivan. He was previously the commander over the Special Operations Division which encompasses the SWAT Team. As you may remember, the SWAT Team has been in compliance for quite some time. Now Commander Sullivan has been put in charge of the Academy. The Academy has been a focus of Monitor reports. It was an area of deliberate non-compliance in IMR 6, and so now they've got somebody over there to whip it into shape, and we're very pleased with those moves.

2.0

2.4

The three filings that we're going to talk about today are the one you just mentioned about Paragraph 308; there's another filing about use-of-force modifications; and then the City's filing yesterday of its Compliance Plan. We're going to talk about those separately during the hearing, but I want to say at the outset, they all hang together. These are deliberate moves to make some changes that will move the reform process forward more efficiently, and they all depend upon one another.

So the first one, as you mentioned before, is the suspension of Paragraph 308. Paragraph 308 has to do with the timing of the Independent Monitor's reports. So those reports come out every six months, and the next report would be coming out in May. Instead, there's not

going to be a full Monitor's report in May. The next full monitoring report will be in November. And in the meantime, we're going to be changing a little bit about what the Monitor does.

2.0

2.4

To contextualize this, I would refer to what Sean Willoughby, the President of the Albuquerque Police Officers' Association, said back in November. He said, "We need a reset button." And so after he said that, we all thought about it. The Monitor really took it to heart, and he made a proposal to the parties about what that reset button could look like.

So Document 355, which is the stipulation about Paragraph 308, is the culmination of the Monitor's proposal. The idea of not having a Monitor's report in May is to provide an opportunity to shift resources from monitoring to technical assistance. Technical assistance is a jargon-ny term, so I'm going to define it. This is a definition I got from the United Nations that I thought was very accurate:

Technical assistance is non-financial assistance provided by specialists. It can take the form of sharing information and expertise, instruction, skills training, transmission of working knowledge, and consulting services and may also involve the transfer of technical data. The aim of technical assistance is to

maximize the quality of project implementation and impact by supporting administration, management, policy development, capacity building, and so on.

2.0

2.4

That's exactly what we're going to be doing for the next several months. The reason we had to make a change in the monitoring methodology was that the Monitor can't both monitor compliance and provide the amount of technical assistance that's really needed. There simply isn't enough of him to go around or enough of his team to go around.

So to keep within the existing budget, we are shifting the resources from monitoring to technical assistance.

On Page 5 of Document 355 there is a bullet list of subjects of technical assistance, and those are — again, as I mentioned before, this is all very much tied up with the other filings that have been made. The technical assistance will go into what the use-of-force investigation process will look like; the revisions to APD's use-of-force policy suite; the training programs that are going to be designed to bring personnel up to speed on the new use-of-force investigation process.

This is the kind of technical assistance that APD has long needed, and we are so grateful that APD is receptive to it now.

Now, I want to be very clear, moving from monitoring compliance to technical assistance is a trade-off. There are things that we lose and things that we gain. One of the things that DOJ is conscious of in this context is that a Monitor has to remain independent and has to assess the agency's efforts in reaching compliance. When they provide technical assistance, that's a slightly different role. They're assisting an agency.

2.0

2.4

And so we get concerned about possibly undermining the independence of the Monitor because they're providing assistance that will lead to compliance efforts that may or may not bear fruit. So we have talked that over with Dr. Ginger, and we feel satisfied that he understands the risks and will maintain, as he always has, his independence and will always be calling balls and strikes based on the evidence. So we don't have concerns about that.

The much bigger trade-off is that we won't have a full comprehensive Monitor's report in May, and so there will be a period from the seventh monitoring period, which runs from August to January of 2018 -- 2017 -- no, I'm sorry, 2018, where there will not be a Monitor's report that will cover that period. And so that's a period of compliance that we just won't have

information about, going forward.

2.0

2.4

We had talked about some strategies to deal with that. One is that in the next Monitor's report coming in November, the Monitor could look at 12-month samples of information so that we would get some compliance information for this six-month period that would have been covered by the May report. We probably won't do that across the board. We'll select particular areas where it makes sense to do that. But that's — that helps.

The other thing that gives us some comfort about losing this May report is the status reports that the City and the Monitor will be filing, and this is how this particular filing marries to the City's Compliance Plan. The City's Compliance Plan lays out in great detail all of the specific steps that they will be taking over the next several months to reach compliance, and they're going to be reporting on their progress in executing those steps.

So it's not that we'll be without information about what the City is doing. We will have a lot of information about what the City is doing, more information from the City than they've given us in the past. And so that gives us some comfort that we're not flying blind during these next few months.

And fundamentally, we accept these trade-offs because they're worth it. Right now, the City needs this type of technical assistance in order to move forward, and this is the most efficient way to get them into compliance.

2.0

2.4

I also wanted to mention that the technical assistance has already begun. The Monitor provided technical assistance during the week of January 15th. He has been providing it all this week. Members of his team will be out in two weeks to provide additional technical assistance. And our expectation, and I believe the City's expectation and the Monitor's expectation, is that after two weeks from now, we'll continue scheduling technical assistance sessions as needed, based on the different projects that are ongoing.

So that's what I have to say about the Paragraph 308 suspension. I'm happy to answer any questions.

THE COURT: I know that you alluded to it, but the people of Albuquerque have been watching this process for a while, and when you say we have to hit a reset button, which we all said -- I think that phrase was used a lot in November -- the people of Albuquerque have to understand and believe that this is necessary,

not been wasted, and that we're not losing ground by not having the Monitor's report for this period of time.

If you don't mind, just address yourself to the citizens of Albuquerque about why -- I mean, I understand what you said.

MR. PAUL KILLEBREW: Yes.

2.0

2.4

THE COURT: But maybe in a broader sense, why this is necessary, why this is worth the time and effort, and the trade-offs, as you said.

MR. PAUL KILLEBREW: Certainly. Certainly.

I think if we just had the Monitor right now assessing compliance, he would find some progress for that six-month period, I hope. But I think most of that period occurred under the previous administration, and I think we knew what their attitude towards this process was, and as that culminated in the hearing last November.

So right now, I think the thing that is most valuable to the people of Albuquerque is improvement in their Police Department, and changes in the systems in the Department. Those changes, they are undertaking tremendous effort and going to great expense to make, but they need help. They need the help of nationally

recognized policing experts who have solved these problems before.

2.0

2.4

That's what the Monitoring Team is. The Monitoring Team is made up of people who are recognized across the country as being experts in policing, and on the exact issues that the Albuquerque Police Department is facing. You can't spend money any better than by getting those folks to give advice and guidance on how to build all the systems that are going to be necessary to foster constitutional policing.

After we filed this joint stipulation, we sent the filing out to our stakeholder and amici community and had three different meetings with folks to get their views on this. And on this particular filing, I'm very pleased to say, everyone recognized that this was a worthwhile investment and this was a reasonable trade-off. We had, I would say -- I'm racking my brain to remember if anyone objected to what we were doing. I don't recall anyone having a problem with it. I think everyone saw that right now what the City needs is the counsel, advice, and guidance of the Monitor Team.

THE COURT: I appreciate the extra comments. Thank you.

Mr. Schmehl, do you have the ball for the City at this point?

MR. PAUL KILLEBREW: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes, sir. Thank you, Mr.

Killebrew.

2.0

2.4

MR. JERAMY SCHMEHL: Your Honor, thank you for this opportunity to address this filing.

I think the best way I can begin the framing of it is to go back to -- I believe it was either the 19th or 20th of December, and Mr. Ginger, or Dr. Ginger, rather, presented his proposal, and there was a brief pause, with the question being asked, "What do you think? Does this sound good?" And the City's response was, "Yes."

So the City stands fully supportive of this approach, moving forward. As Mr. Killebrew spelled out, it's going to afford an opportunity to get some assistance, needed technical assistance from the experts in the Monitoring Team, and I think that he has done a good job of capturing that and explaining that to the Court and everyone here today.

What I want to focus on, as well, is the City's obligation. And the City's obligation under this is not to disappear; it's not to rest on its laurels; it's to provide reports. And it's spelled out, the first one coming out June the 1st, and the second one coming out August 31st.

And those reports are going to talk about what's happening, you know, giving real reports to the community for the first time, from the City's perspective, about what's working, what's not working, as the Compliance Plan spells out who's responsible for making it work. And those types of things are first.

2.0

2.4

And Your Honor very clearly ordered, the last time we were in court, in November, that that needed to happen. And that filing was made yesterday, on the eve of this hearing today.

And so in that vein, to get that conversation started, as Mr. Killebrew explained, we had meetings with the amici. We explained the stipulations. And that's the beginning of those conversations. What's going to happen moving forward? There's a commitment from the City and the Department, approximately every six weeks or whatever interval makes sense to those amici, we're going to sit down and talk to them. We're not going to wait until the eve of the hearing, whether it's the one in November, the one in November the prior year, to learn about problems. We're going to have very real conversations and engage in a dialogue, rather than a monologue that just simply hasn't been working. And the City is committed to that, and the Department is committed to that.

And I also think the Compliance Plan really overlays on top of this whole restart, refresh, recharge, way forward, whatever anyone wants to call it. And I think it's a perfect overlay because it brings structure to those communications. You're talking about those areas of deliberate non-compliance that were very clearly spelled out in the Compliance Plan, and the first five areas, you know, many of them center around resources, use of force, the Implementation Unit. And then those concerns were raised by the amici, dating back to the action plan that was filed with the Court, I believe Documents 315 and 319.

2.0

2.4

So this joint stipulation certainly represents an opportunity to step back and assess and figure out a way forward. But what the City is taking this as is an opportunity to do that, but also speak to the community, talk to them about the challenges and problems, and actually get their input and ideas and concerns so that this reform effort reflects what it should be, that it's a collaborative effort to bring constitutional policing to the City of Albuquerque.

That's it, Judge, unless you have some questions for me. I'm happy to answer them.

THE COURT: I don't think so at this point,
Mr. Schmehl, but I want to just the alert amici --

they're going to address the Court at some point in the afternoon. We're hearing some representations about your involvement in this reset and in signing off or not. I want to hear from you about your thoughts on the reset, on this way forward, as it's been described by the Doctor. So thank you.

And I think we'll hear from Mr. Mowrer.

MR. JERAMY SCHMEHL: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

2.0

2.4

MR. FREDERICK MOWRER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Thank you for the pleasure of being able to address the Court.

Your Honor, the APOA believes -- since we're using the term, I'll continue to use it -- a reset probably was appropriate at the time that button was pushed. As the Court knows, many, many years ago, it seems like a long time ago, the APOA took the position that this process was moving too fast and that we were missing things that needed to be addressed. I think that reset has now been hit. I think that the monitoring program as dictated in 355 probably does need to be changed to allow the Monitor to switch focus, so instead of providing another report where he documents the things that aren't working, that he can provide technical assistance not only to the City, but to the

employees of the Albuquerque Police Department, to show them changes that would probably be helpful for all concerned. And the APOA adopts that.

2.0

2.4

The APOA believes that the reset is necessary. In light of the other changes that are also being proposed to the Court, it only makes sense to save resources, because they are finite in nature, to save those resources, apply them in a different way, use the technical assistance that the Monitor and his team can provide to not only the City, but also to the members of the Association, and teach us a way forward that makes better sense. Because the way we were going did not appear to me, I think, and to the Union at many times, to be moving forward at a pace that made any sense.

So we wholeheartedly adopt this proposed change to Document 355 or Paragraph 308 of the CASA.

THE COURT: Mr. Mowrer, thank you. It occurs to me, though -- and if it was addressed, I missed it. We've talked about the meeting that we went to in Ft. Worth. Have other Monitors around the country, in the other eight Consent Decree programs, ever been called upon to provide the technical assistance to make this sort of transitional step?

MR. FREDERICK MOWRER: Your Honor, I'm not aware that they have been, but I'm speaking from just

my vague impression of how these Consent Decrees have gone. But I think this may be the first one where the parties have sat down and agreed to change focus in the middle of the process, to try and effectuate change.

THE COURT: And I understood your exposure to it might be different. But Mr. Killebrew or Mr. Schmehl, can you address my question?

Thank you, Mr. Mowrer.

2.0

2.4

MR. FREDERICK MOWRER: Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. PAUL KILLEBREW: Certainly, Your Honor.

Thank you.

We -- I believe Paragraph 305 of the CASA explicitly provides that the Monitor can provide technical assistance. That's in there because it's our experience in these policing and Consent Decree cases that technical assistance is often necessary. The scale of it can be very, very small; or, as here, very large. And so we remain open to the idea that the Monitor may be able to provide technical assistance.

There has actually already been some technical assistance provided in Albuquerque. Stephen Rickman, who is on the Monitoring Team, has provided technical assistance to the City to help get the Community Policing Councils established, and he provided training to the members of the Community Policing Councils that

was incredibly effective. So it is fairly common in these cases to have the experts and the Monitoring Team provide this technical assistance.

2.0

2.4

In terms of the shift that we're making, though, of substituting technical assistance for monitoring for a brief period, I'm not aware that we've done that before. The closest parallel that I can think of is what we've done in Puerto Rico, where the beginning of that process is not monitoring compliance; it's capacity building.

There is a, I believe, four- or five-year capacity building period where the entire focus is just on establishing the basic infrastructure, both in terms of policy and technology and all the basics within the Police Department there, before we even start measuring compliance. And the Monitoring Team is very much a part of establishing those systems.

And so it's just a recognition that there are conditions sometimes where the way everyone needs to be spending their resources is on developing the agency's capacity, and I think that's largely where we are with APD right now. The DOJ, the Monitoring Team, the Union, the City, we're all engaged in a collaborative effort to build capacity within APD and build the systems that will lead to compliance.

THE COURT: Thank you. And I think I really do appreciate the insight, and I bet those here do, as well. But this isn't starting from scratch with something. And the fact is, Consent Decrees, I've learned recently, look a lot alike from one jurisdiction to another. They all come from the Department of Justice at some point. And so this built-in allowance for technical assistance finds itself in most of them, I guess.

MR. PAUL KILLEBREW: Yes, that's right.

There are provisions of the Consent Decrees that look very similar to one another, and those are typically the process-related ones, the ones that have to do with the monitoring process. And that's because we have now about 25 years of experience doing this work and working with Monitors, and we've learned some things.

And one of the things we've learned is about sometimes you've got this team of experts that is sitting right there. Why can't we use them as a resource? It's an obvious thing that we want to do.

THE COURT: Good. Well, thank you for the insight.

MR. PAUL KILLEBREW: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Dr. Ginger, do you want to be

heard on this topic?

2.0

2.4

DR. JAMES GINGER: Yes, sir, if you don't mind.

THE COURT: Of course not.

2.0

2.4

DR. JAMES GINGER: As the Court knows, I've been involved in these monitoring projects since the early 2000s. I've been a student of and participating in projects since that point in time. There have been numerous occasions where there has been a change to the administration in a location where there's a monitoring project underway. But to my knowledge, we've never had the confluence of events, the change of administration and an earlier administration that was so resistant to change, as we've had here.

So as a result, we provided what will in effect be virtually the same amount of technical assistance to the APD in the first two years of this project. We budgeted for it. We provided it. It wasn't accepted, I guess. It wasn't used. So what happened, then, with the change of administration, we have a long-lived Settlement Agreement and a new administration that has not had the benefit of that previous technical assistance.

So that's why I developed the Way Forward

Plan, because I recognized that this Police Department,

this new Police Department as configured today, had not

had the benefit of the earlier technical assistance, but they still had the same problems that confronted the APD the first day we walked on the job.

2.0

2.4

So historically, that had never happened before, so we needed to design something relatively new, relatively efficient, and very effective. And hopefully, that's what we've done. And it will allow us to continue our responsibilities without asking for more money, and it will allow the City to continue to grow its responses without paying for additional technical assistance to the Monitoring Team So we've tried to hold the budget at the same level; and yet, give APD what it needs in terms of our insight into what's happening and what needs to happen.

THE COURT: Thank you, Doctor.

On the notion of the Compliance Bureau that the City is in the process of standing up, a couple of questions. One, have you been involved with this work in any jurisdiction where the administration, the City administration and the Police Department actually had a Compliance Bureau or stood one up?

DR. JAMES GINGER: 100 percent of the ones
I've been involved in had it. Usually on my first
visit, the Chief Executive Officer of the Police
Department and I sat down and had a long conversation

about how this process is going to work. We present them with our relatively detailed methodology of how we're going to do our job. And we, the Monitoring Team, make a recommendation to that Chief Executive that they consider the development of the Implementation Division or Bureau or whatever it turns out to be labeled. And it always comes to a different name because people like to change that up. They don't like to follow in lock-step with other Police Departments.

2.0

2.4

So I have been involved with -- I was the Monitor in Pittsburgh, I was involved in the LAPD process, and I was the Monitor for New Jersey State Police, and all three of those organizations, as a first step, developed the equivalent of a Compliance Bureau.

APD chose not to do that, against our advice. But the choice was made. And we were still required to monitor progress, which as you well know we did for quite some time. But now we find the Police Department, through no fault of its own, through no fault of its current leadership, who has been lacking a Compliance Bureau for almost three and a half years now, and that's a serious delay in the usual process.

So what I tried to do with this Way Forward Plan was to compensate for that, so that you could stay

reasonably on schedule; and yet, not deprive APD of the knowledge and technical assistance they needed.

2.0

2.4

THE COURT: So did your provision of technical assistance extend to the standing up of the Compliance Bureau? And as I understood the whole point of a Compliance Bureau, it's ultimately the Police Department can measure its own progress and can continue to measure its progress against norms that we all agree ought to be in place long after you're gone or long after I'm gone.

And that's the deal, right?

DR. JAMES GINGER: Correct.

THE COURT: So I know earlier on, you had a hard time getting data that you could use in developing your reports. The Compliance Bureau will be giving you that data, right?

DR. JAMES GINGER: Correct.

THE COURT: So are you providing them technical assistance? Is that part of this reset?

DR. JAMES GINGER: Yes, Your Honor, it absolutely is. I've been here all week, and I've spent the vast majority of my time with personnel from the Compliance Bureau, and the team has spent a great deal of time with folks from the Training Academy, which were the two major weaknesses we identified, other than

1 supervision, in our monitoring, earlier monitoring 2 reports. So we've been laser focused on making sure 3 that Chief Garcia has the knowledge and understanding 4 5 and even the personnel support, the people to do the job that that Compliance Bureau is charged with. 6 7 THE COURT: Do they have any Harry Potters over there? 8 9 DR. JAMES GINGER: They do, Your Honor, 10 although I have to say that this would be a Harriette 11 Potter. 12 THE COURT: Fair enough. Fair enough. 13 Anything else, Doctor? 14 DR. JAMES GINGER: No, sir. 15 THE COURT: At this point? 16 DR. JAMES GINGER: No. 17 THE COURT: Thank you. Thanks very much. 18 Well, Mr. Killebrew, you're back up. Have you 19 got a spring in your chair? We'll be talking about the 2.0 stipulation modifying CASA use-of-force provisions, and 21 this is Document 354. I'll hear you. 22 MR. PAUL KILLEBREW: Thank you. Thank you 23 very much, Your Honor. 2.4 Yes, while Document 354, which is the joint --

the brief that explains the modifications as to use of

25

force -- and I apologize that we made some mistakes in the attachment to that document, which is the red line that shows the changes to the CASA, and we filed an errata, which is Document 356-1, that shows the correct changes. And I apologize for that oversight and take responsibility for them. But 356-1 we have checked quite thoroughly, and it is the correct document.

2.0

2.4

So what this is about is the central issue of this case. The most intractable problem in this reform effort is getting APD to the point where it can identify and appropriately address unconstitutional uses of force. That's why DOJ opened an investigation of the Police Department. That's why we have a Consent Decree. That's why we've had six Monitor reports, a special report, and an outcome assessment report, all critical of the APD's ability when it comes to recognizing our policy and unconstitutional uses of force.

This is the problem we are here to solve, and we don't leave until we solve it.

So what we have seen across all of the reports is that the systems that APD had set up simply were not working. And there are a number of causes for those failures, but it brought to light that we needed to rethink how we were tackling the problem in light of what we were seeing from the process failures of APD.

So around July of 2017, we started having discussions among the parties and the Monitor about different approaches, and we thought about: Are there things that we could do, that would stay within the confines of the CASA, that might get us there faster? Or do we need to start putting on the table changing the CASA in order to get better systems set up?

2.0

2.4

Along those discussions, one of the things we recognized was that supervisors at APD were simply having an incredibly difficult time appropriately investigating uses of force. And the CASA, as originally set out, gave supervisors, the first-line supervisors, the sergeants, extensive responsibilities when it came to uses of force.

For most uses of force, the supervisor is supposed to show up at the scene and conduct a full investigation of the entire incident, write up a full investigation report, and send it up through their chain of command. And, as the monitoring reports detail, those investigations — there was a great variability in the quality of those investigations. And as a system, we had to recognize that relying on supervisors for this function was not going to solve our use—of—force problem. They simply did not have this ability to get these investigations done right.

The other thing we saw was that APD had created a Centralized Unit to investigate the most serious uses of force, and that unit was professionalizing, and its investigations were gaining in quality and consistency.

2.0

2.4

So as we discussed how to handle the use-of-force problem, and really the use-of-force investigation problem, we thought maybe it makes sense to diminish the role of supervisors and expand the role of the Centralized Unit. So that is essentially where we landed.

I should say also, the supervisors — it's not fair to just say they didn't, you know, they didn't know how to do good investigations. They were not given a policy that was a model of clarity. They were not given training that really explained to them what they needed to do. And we simply didn't understand the workload and the strain that was going to put on them, to have to conduct all of these investigations. So essentially, we just didn't set them up for success.

But going forward, we realized that having a Centralized Unit with responsibility for more force investigations would make it easier to assess when there's a problem with those investigations and correct them. Because it's one unit, and you can have much

tighter command and control over this one Centralized
Unit than you can over an entire agency of supervisors.

2.0

2.4

So the system we set up was moved into what we're calling Level 1, Level 2, and Level 3 uses of force.

Level 1 uses of force are non-injury force.

There is no actual injury. There is no complaint of injury. These are the very, very minor uses of force.

A good example would be when someone is being handcuffed and they tense or move their arms to resist being handcuffed, and the officer has to use physical effort to bring their hands together and handcuff the person.

That officer is using physical force to overcome resistance, and so it qualifies within the meanings, within the definitions of the CASA and the Fourth Amendment, as a seizure as force.

But that is a very low level kind of that's not -- there hasn't been an injury. It just needs to be addressed and made sure it was appropriate, but it's not as serious, obviously, as something like an officer-involved shooting or a taser.

So for that very low-level use of force, the officer who uses force would still call their supervisor out to the scene. The supervisor will show up, talk to the officer, talk to the subject if they're willing, any

other witnesses who may be there, and they have the capability to immediately play back the body-worn camera footage of the incident on their cellphones, right there on the spot.

2.0

2.4

And so the supervisor can make an assessment about: Was this actually a Level 1 use of force, or was it more serious?

If it was just a Level 1 use of force, then the responsibility is on the officer to document the force they used and the circumstances that led to it, to put that into a use-of-force report, and they have to do that by the end of the shift. The supervisor will then review that report, make sure that the force used was appropriate. If it wasn't appropriate, then the supervisor needs to address that. Assuming it was, the supervisor will then send that report up his chain of command or her chain of command within the district that they work in.

After it's been approved all the way through the chain of command, up through the commander, it will go to a Central Unit called the Performance Review Unit that is going to be looking at every single Level 1 use of force across the Department. And their function is essentially quality assurance. They're going to be looking at the package and making sure that it meets APD

standards of quality, and also making sure that the use of force was appropriate. So it's another layer of review.

2.0

2.4

That unit can also be collecting data on

Level 1 uses of force so that they can identify trends.

And so if they see a spike in one form of force, they

can identify if there's something going on that we need

to address through a policy change or through training.

So that's how Level 1 uses of force would be handled. Again, it's force that does not lead to an injury or complaint of injury, so it's at the very, very low end.

Anything that results in an injury -
THE COURT: Mr. Killebrew, before you go on
to Number 2 --

MR. PAUL KILLEBREW: Yes.

THE COURT: I'm sure it's here somewhere, but I can't find the PRU on the APD or the OC. There's an acronym for everything here. But where is the PRU on the organizational chart? I'm trying to track. The supervisor in the field makes the report, and it goes to PRU.

Mr. Schmehl.

MR. JERAMY SCHMEHL: Yes, Your Honor. That will be housed in the Compliance Bureau, so that

1 Performance Review Unit would be -- and I don't know 2 that the organizational chart is going down to that 3 level, that breakout level. So it's not spelled out on that, but we certainly can get one that breaks it down 4 5 into divisions and sections and whatnot so it's more 6 clear. But that will be housed within the Compliance 7 Bureau. 8 THE COURT: Okay. So under Compliance 9 Bureau, or associated with it, Compliance Division, 10 Behavioral Health and Crisis Intervention. But is it 11 under the Compliance Division? Is that where I find 12 it? 13 MR. JERAMY SCHMEHL: Yes, Your Honor. 14 THE COURT: Everybody is shaking their head. 15 Okay. 16 MR. JERAMY SCHMEHL: Yes. And like I said, 17 Your Honor, we can provide a breakout of that with more 18 detail, because I think that's a very good question, 19 and it's just an oversight on those organizational 2.0 charts. It's just sort of a higher level org chart. 21 THE COURT: Well, great. I appreciate the 22 insight. 23 MR. JERAMY SCHMEHL: Thank you.

THE COURT: I didn't mean to interrupt you.

2.4

25

Go ahead.

MR. PAUL KILLEBREW: Oh, no. Thank you, Your Honor. All right. So Level 2 uses of force is force where there is an injury. And Level 3 force obviously results in injury. But Level 2 is essentially an intermediate level of force, and this would include like a tasing or the use of an impact weapon.

2.0

2.4

And Level 2 uses of force, as soon as it happens, the officer calls their supervisor. The supervisor comes out to the scene, again, to make sure that it's correctly categorized. And then they call a Centralized Unit, which will be called a Force Investigation Section. And the Force Investigation Section, perhaps we should go ahead and clarify where it will be housed.

THE COURT: I found it on Administrative Support Bureau. Is that right? Force Investigation Team.

MR. JERAMY SCHMEHL: That's correct, Your Honor. Well, actually, that would be Force Investigation Section, and then within that section you have those investigations. So then you'd have, of course, the division above the section, but it would be in that administrative chart.

THE COURT: Okay. I think I've got that one located.

MR. PAUL KILLEBREW: Okay. So the Force Investigation Section handles the investigation from all Level 2 and Level 3 uses of force. There is an equivalent division right now that looks at what has been called serious uses of force, and serious uses of force is equivalent to a Level 3 under this new system, Level 3 use of force.

2.0

2.4

So they'll be looking at more kinds of force, as I said before. Level 2 is where we're taking uses of force that supervisors used to investigate and giving them to the Force Investigation Section. The Force Investigation Section will be conducting the thorough kinds of investigations that we've seen already for serious uses of force and the kinds of investigations that we had expected supervisors to be carrying out, but that we weren't seeing by and large.

So Level 2 and Level 3 will be the same thing. Level 3 is, again, equivalent to serious uses of force. When it happens, the officer calls the supervisor, who comes to the scene, makes sure it was correctly categorized. And then the supervisor calls the Force Investigation Section, and they will come and take over the investigation.

So the advantages to us under this system are that if there is an issue in how the Force Investigation

Section is conducting its work, it's much easier to correct.

2.0

2.4

And the parallel I would draw here would be to the SWAT Team. Part of the reason the SWAT Team came into compliance so quickly was that you had very direct command and control. It's a unit that has to be responsive directly to their chain of command. It's a relatively small unit, and when that commander orders policy changes or orders training, he knows very quickly whether or not that has happened, and he can hold the members of that unit accountable if they're falling down on the job, and he can do it quickly.

And that's what we're looking for under the Force Investigation Section, for that sort of very direct, very clear management.

So it's our hope that this will -- it is our expectation that this will improve force investigations.

Again, there are trade-offs to this change. There are things we give up and things that we gain.

And the trade-off here is what's happening with Level 1 uses of force. Those, before, would have been subjected to a full supervisory investigation. And now, we're relying on the officer to document their use of force correctly, to explain in writing why they used force; and we're relying on supervisors to review that

information and make sure it's all correct and meets the standards of quality in the agency. This gives me some trepidation. I'll be honest.

2.0

2.4

When we were investigating APD and reviewing use-of-force reports, we found that officers often failed to adequately describe the force that they used. The language they used, you couldn't tell what they had done. And they failed to adequately describe why they used force. They didn't explain what the threat they perceived was. They didn't explain if there were circumstances there that led to the use of force. And so there were some reports that we simply just couldn't use in the investigation because there wasn't enough detail or information there for us to make an assessment.

So under this new system, here's the scenario I'm worried about. An officer uses force, documents it poorly. A supervisor signs off on it anyway, and it goes up through the chain of command, and then eventually it lands with DOJ and the Monitor. And we look at this thing and we say, "How could this possibly have gotten through APD's systems? You just can't even tell what happened in this incident."

So that is my concern, that that's what's going to happen. I've alerted the City and APD to that

concern. What we expect to happen is that they will provide better training to line officers and to supervisors about what these use-of-force reports need to contain; and the level of detail that officers need to be using when they describe the force that they're using; and that this review unit is going to truly audit each of those reports and make sure that they get sent back for correction when something isn't going right.

2.0

2.4

And that send-back from that Centralized Unit is looking at all the Level 1s, and that doesn't just go to the line officer who didn't write up the force report correctly. It has to go back down through that chain of command. Because if the Force Review Unit is catching it, that means that the commander didn't catch it, the lieutenant didn't catch it, the sergeant didn't catch it. All those folks have to get into the practice of making sure that these reports are of adequate quality.

I think this trade-off and this risk is worth it, primarily because of what's happening to Level 2 uses of force. These will now be going to the Centralized Unit instead of being investigated by supervisors. I expect there to be an immediate increase in the quality of those kinds of investigations, which is what we need to see.

So we expect higher quality investigations.

We expect to see accurate findings. We expect to see

APD holding its officers accountable. And we expect to
see an elimination of the pattern of unconstitutional
uses of force. That's what we're here to do, and we're
not going to leave until that has happened.

2.0

2.4

And, Your Honor, with that, I'll take any questions that you may have.

THE COURT: Well, an obvious question and concern is, you're relying on the officer that has just used force to self-report.

MR. PAUL KILLEBREW: Yes.

THE COURT: And I see a potential concern there.

MR. PAUL KILLEBREW: Yes.

THE COURT: If he's responsible for initiating the process, maybe the process doesn't get initiated at all. And I'm interested in hearing from Mr. Mowrer on behalf of the Police Union and the City in terms of why this isn't the concern that it seems to me. So they either don't report, or they under-report, and the supervisor can check this on the basis of the body cam.

MR. PAUL KILLEBREW: Yes.

THE COURT: If that's been appropriately used

and preserved.

2.0

2.4

MR. PAUL KILLEBREW: Yes.

THE COURT: But there's a couple of problem areas there we've already experienced, getting to this point.

MR. PAUL KILLEBREW: Yes.

THE COURT: So I understand. You've expressed the concern. I share it. We'll see how that goes forward.

MR. PAUL KILLEBREW: Yes. I will say, in just responding to this concern about unreported force, I thought about that in preparing my remarks today, and I didn't add it, mainly because that's an existing risk. This new system doesn't change that risk.

And the way that we've decided to address that risk, which we all recognize and have actually seen played out, is that we have the whole host of systems that are set up to identify when this is happening, at least some of the time. The supervisors are doing random reviews of body camera footage on a regular basis for each of their subordinates, and if they see unreported force through that, they can then look into it.

Not reporting force is misconduct, and an officer would be -- the expectation is that an officer

would be held accountable for failing to report force.

The individual who is the subject of the force could file a civilian complaint, and the Civilian Police Oversight Agency could then conduct an investigation.

2.0

2.4

And I believe that APD is also looking into enhancing its video review so that there's more video review that's being conducted within the agency. They don't want to put all the weight on the supervisors to do it, but they're looking into the possibility of having a unit looking at video more regularly.

So those are a number of things that we do to address unreported force, but it is a problem and it's something that we all take really seriously. And to catch it, we'll be addressing it.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. PAUL KILLEBREW: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Schmehl, as a part of your remarks, you might alert everyone to kind of a new policy about body cam footage, and the new administration is more open about sharing that, and you might talk about that some.

MR. JERAMY SCHMEHL: Certainly, Your Honor, and thank you.

I want to first address the confusion that was my fault about the organizational chart. These changes

are so new. They are proposed changes, as they are set out in the document there, the amended Settlement Agreement. So when we're talking about the Performance Review Unit and the Force Investigation Section, the investigators, those are bureaucracies that are being staffed up and considered, and then those will be brought to an organizational chart that more clearly and definitively spells out what that will look like. So I just want to let you know that that was the case. This is a situation of us improving and growing, and that's why there was that confusion.

2.0

2.4

I want to talk about -- because I think

Mr. Killebrew did a really good job of going over the

levels of force; the investigative response to Level 2

or Level 3 force; and then the review that would happen

after a Level 1 force incident took place.

I want to focus in on what I perceive -- what the City perceives to be the issues, you know, developing the policy and the training, those types of things. But actually, before I do that, I want to take just a step back and say that this was brought to the table. Certainly there were a lot of conversations in the Department, all the way down to the point where last night at the CPC summit, I was having a conversation with an attendee, and he was aware of all of the

problems with the former -- well, hope to be former -- force reporting and investigation system, particularly the burdens placed on supervisors.

2.0

2.4

The Union, particularly Mr. Willoughby, played a very central role in bringing this to the table, a draft proposal of the system, and what now is the language in the amendments to the Settlement Agreement were presented. And that was really what got the ball formally rolling because these conversations have been happening, as I said, all the way down to community members, certainly in the Department, and now the City is very happy to see them as part of this new change process.

So the challenges. The challenges are going to be, as Mr. Killebrew said, one challenge, and what he said was: Well, what about the unreported force? Where are you going to find it? It is an expected risk, where something happens in a system, where people are expected to report force.

With this new approach, there's an ability to centralize the thought around looking for that. There's an ability to say: Well, let's pull reports where there's resisting arrest. Let's pull reports where there's assault on a police officer, or battery on a police officer, and let's start looking for it.

In the old system, in the sort of scattered approach, there wasn't a centralized way to start to look at those issues and to start to think about that data and the reports, to address the problem and find the report or even when it hasn't been reported. So I think that's important, to think about it.

2.0

2.4

And the centralization of force reporting investigations also brings to it a standardization to the investigation, and I think that is very, very critical. If you picked up any of the Monitor's reports, you'll see that as a consistent, persistent, and accurate critique of what is happening in force reporting and investigations — and now, particularly, like I said, the investigations.

What does right look like? You know, when you look at certain paragraphs -- for instance, the obligation on an officer who uses the force, you know, to describe the contact, the force, all those types of things. Well, what is a sufficient depiction of those things from an eye that is lending scrutiny to that investigation? Then when you move to considerations of that investigation, all the way down to what is an adequate canvass for witnesses, making sure from just the lowest level that you're writing down the names and addresses of witnesses.

So this new system will allow for a very focused consideration when you're talking about the Level 2 or 3 use of force, on making sure that the product is going to meet the requirements and, really, the standards set by the Settlement Agreement, and lending something to the conversation of what should that be, to the development of forms that are more efficient.

2.0

2.4

There is a blank sheet approach right now -Dr. Ginger has talked about that -- which is, you know,
it's just really difficult for you to go in and look at
that investigation and say, "This meets scrutiny," or
"This fails to meet scrutiny." So there is an emphasis,
I believe, moving forward, on being able to address
those concerns in a very central, focused way.

The other thing is the training. You're going to be able to provide the training in that same way. You're going to have a smaller span of control. Right now, these use-of-force investigations are under supervisor level, so what would be akin to a Level 2 are being done across six area commands.

So given the vast confusion around, really, the policy, the inadequacies in the training, and then the product coming out of it, it is across the board to the point where there are conversations across different

area commands, saying: Well, no, I think it should be this way, or this way, or this way.

2.0

2.4

So that's going to be addressed by the new force reporting investigation approach considered by this stipulation and the attached document.

And I almost think that's another risk. What do you do if something — the way I would phrase it is, something that wasn't supposed to make it through, it makes it through. I think that's a system of accountability that you have to create.

So we're talking about a 95 percent expectation of compliance. Certainly everyone would like for it to be 100 percent, but we're dealing with human factors. That whole system, when it starts with the Force Investigation Section investigator, or when it's a Level 1, where it's a review in the field, they have to be held accountable.

And that's the reason why the review of this work is being done within the Compliance Bureau, to lend more of an eye to an audit or a review that's outside of what created it. And I think that's crucial to take into consideration, because as it stands, that doesn't exist. And I believe that if it did exist, it should be in that way. It shouldn't be something that's part of the system creating it, to scrutinize it and say it is

sufficient or not.

2.0

2.4

This approach also does away with, in my opinion, for the most part — certainly serious use of force is still a consideration, but it treats force, whether it's a Level 2 or a Level 3, the more — the higher level force that's likely to lead to either injury or serious injury, the same. And that was already the reality of these provisions in the Settlement Agreement.

There was an immense amount of confusion that when I'm involved in a field use of force where it's something that causes a low level of injury or a lower level of injury, it's somehow different than a serious use of force. Force is force. What's important about it is how it's reported; how it's investigated; and how officers, whether it's in that review, the chain of command, or whether it's in the Force Investigation Section, and those investigators, through that chain of command, are held accountable for the product, and then an officer is held accountable to the standard of constitutional policing.

And, Your Honor, you asked a question at the beginning, and I'd like to answer that and any other questions you have. Otherwise, I think I've summarized the City's position on these considerations.

THE COURT: Thank you.

2.0

2.4

MR. JERAMY SCHMEHL: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Mowrer?

MR. FREDERICK MOWRER: Thank you, Your Honor.

I would like to first of all thank the City
Attorney for giving credit to APOA President Willoughby
and Vice-President Montgomery for helping lead this
change. We realized early on that the force reporting
system that was being used was not working.

Probably the biggest problem that we noticed and wanted the changes that we pushed for, and I think is now implemented, is that supervisors in the field need to be supervisors in the field, and what we had lost was the supervisors in the field. They were spending their entire day or days investigating use-of-force complaints, and not managing the people under their command, staff in the field. And that's what their job is.

So we helped implement -- and I'd like to thank President Willoughby and Vice-President Montgomery for the leadership in this. We helped implement this drive to try and simplify these levels so that we could get sergeants back in the field, supervising their individual members of their squads, and help improve the services that this Department provides the public.

So we believe that the critical changes to this use-of-force provision, these three steps, the steps that will be taken to investigate the use of force, will be successful and will help implement the changes that have been advocated by the Monitor and by the DOJ.

2.0

2.4

And to answer your question specifically, my sense of this is, not the lack of reporting of the use of force. That happens because people are human beings, people make mistakes, and sometimes there will be a lack of reporting because an individual decides to try and avoid it. But I think the vast majority of any encounter with the general public in the City of Albuquerque is reported, it's reported timely, and it's reported accurately.

What we noted and what we thought the failure was or what was not working appropriately was the quality of the review of the use of force that was being reported to the supervisors. What we hope that this three-step process will do now is free up supervisors to deal with Level 1, which I think Mr. Killebrew pretty much accurately described. Level 2 and Level 3 will be identified by supervisors who report and will have access to the individual officer and witnesses and to the video camera, and call out a separate team that will

investigate these separate levels. You'll get a better quality of investigation, freeing up the supervisors to work in the field, and giving it to people who have been trained to do this level of investigation for the use of force that has been reported.

So what the APOA believes is that while we recognize there's a risk, there's always a risk with human beings involved in any process, Your Honor. But we don't think the reporting of use of force is the problem here. We think it's the quality of the reports that are generated, the quality of the reporting that's done, and the quality of the reviewing that was being done was the problem. And we think this system will clarify that, simplify that, and send a better product up for review by what's now called the Compliance Bureau.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Dr. Ginger.

2.0

2.4

DR. JAMES GINGER: Thank you, Your Honor.

It was relatively easy for the Monitoring Team to support this change because, as the Court knows, I'm a process guy. I look at flow charts and those sorts of things to determine what a process is going to look like.

The change proffered by the parties in this

case literally increases the review rate of the minor uses of force -- for example, an over-tight handcuff or something like that -- by 33 percent. Under the old system, it was the regular APD supervisory command tier at the area station and the Monitoring Team. Under the new system, it's still those two, but it also will involve DC Garcia's Compliance Unit, who will conduct similar types of reviews. So basically, we didn't reduce the level of reviews. We increased it. So we support the proposed change.

2.0

2.4

Because the other output of that is, we have a more manageable system. And I advised the parties, almost from Day One, that truly the only way out of this Consent Decree involved three stripes on sergeants' uniforms. If they didn't get their sergeants involved — and every agency I've been involved with, they had to markedly increase the number of supervisors in place, so to speak, in order to come into compliance. This system actually increases supervision of the types of use of force that could easily, normally, slip through the cracks.

So the Monitoring Team supports it.

THE COURT: Good. Thank you, Doctor.

It occurs to me that I haven't heard from the new Chief, and you certainly are welcome to address any

of this, or all of this, as you would like. But I didn't mention that the new Chief was at that meeting that I talked about earlier. And if I recall correctly, he came out of retirement to do this. Is that right, Chief?

2.0

2.4

MR. MICHAEL GEIER: That's correct.

THE COURT: I said at the time, "Goodness, it would have been easy for you to sit this one out."

But you came in with your eyes wide open, and that was part of the commitment on behalf of the City and the Police Department that got me to stick around.

So thank you for that. I had meant to say that earlier.

The Compliance Plan is next. Deputy Chief Garcia.

MR. ERIC GARCIA: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

Deputy Chief Eric Garcia with the Albuquerque Police

Department Compliance Bureau, and I'll be going over an overview of the Compliance Plan that we filed with the Court yesterday.

First of all, I'd say the first five areas of the Compliance Plan specifically address the findings of deliberate non-compliance and deliberate indifference by the City. The sixth area will address the concerns of the amici that were brought to the Court's attention on November 16th of 2017.

After conferring with IMT, the Independent Monitoring Team, Your Honor, the parties, and the amici, the first version of our Compliance Plan, we realized we had kind of aggressive deadlines and it was an unrealistic approach. So after speaking to the amici, the DOJ, and the Monitoring Team, we needed to set realistic expectations because we didn't want to be in the same place the previous administration was, where we could not meet deadlines. We needed to set expectations about what we could realistically accomplish between February and July of this year.

2.0

2.4

This Compliance Plan is a living and working document, but it continues to be building upon it. Also included in the Compliance Plan, at the suggestion of the amici, is a legend that defines certain terms and acronyms that we have in the plan. I think that was important. That was something that I think we needed to realize, because it's not just the Police Department looking at this stuff. We need to be understandable to the Court and to the public.

Also, we included a list of reference materials in the document because we want our personnel to know where they can look for additional information for certain things like job-task analysis, completed staff work, things of that nature.

The Compliance Plan itself, Your Honor, is, like I said, divided into six areas.

2.0

2.4

The first area was the use-of-force investigations backlog. We believe that's a critical area at this time. Specific compliance issues that need to be addressed with that issue, that area of concern, are review, remediate, and decrease the backlog of field use-of-force investigations. Due to the process and the complicated process we have in place right now, there's a backlog, and we need to address that backlog.

We have created a commander position for the Internal Affairs force which will be in charge of the Force Investigation Section — that commander is Commander Robert Middleton — which I think is going to greatly assist us in achieving compliance and understanding the process that we need to do to meet these issues of deliberate non-compliance.

We have specific deadlines on each of these, as well. And initially, like I said, the deadlines, we're pretty close. We expanded upon those because we want to be sure we can meet those deadlines. We don't want to rush, and we also don't want to lay back and not be addressing these issues. They need to be addressed, but we need to be realistic, to be sure we can meet those deadlines and expectations of the Court.

Also attached to each of the areas are specific actions; basically, tasks that we need to achieve to meet each of these areas, where we are meeting these areas of non-compliance and deliberate indifference.

2.0

2.4

We also have an area of use-of-force investigations backlog that is going to deal with the backlog of serious use-of-force investigations, because we also have a backlog there, as well, that our Critical Incident Review Team is handling now. A new system that we are proposing to put in place should address this, as well.

Our second area of our Compliance Plan is the APD Implementation Unit. We quickly realized that there wasn't much, if any, dedicated resources to the Implementation Unit. That's why we created the Compliance Bureau. And especially after being in the conference in Ft. Worth, we realized agencies who are farther ahead than we are, like New Orleans, Seattle, they have a whole dedicated Bureau dedicated to compliance, and that's what we are settling right now.

We've got to create that implementation needed within the Compliance Bureau. And with that

Implementation Unit, we are creating two civilian managers who will be answering to a lieutenant. It's

Lieutenant Cori Lowe. She has been helping me quite a bit with the forming of the Compliance Bureau. Those two managers will be civilian managers. We're going to have one that's going to be in charge of the Implementation Unit, itself, and another one in charge of the Performance Metrics Unit. Because basically we have to implement everything, but we have to have some type of measurement to show that we are meeting our goals and our objectives.

2.0

2.4

Again, under the APD Implementation Unit, we have created a Compliance Division. We have a series of tasks that are specific to the needs of creating this Bureau and Implementation Unit.

Lieutenant Cori Lowe from the Compliance

Division will be the responsible person for those. And,

again, we have deadlines in place. And we also freeze

these areas.

We also have an area where you put for proof of compliance and data sources, course of business documents that show that we are completing these tasks and show the Court that we are meeting these, and show the public that we are meeting all of those tasks.

Under the Implementation Unit we also have a manual published, SOP, our policy development process. We have worked with the amici and the public on

developing this process. We understood that the original process was very difficult to understand, had too many steps. It was complicated. I don't think the public understood it, and I think a lot of personnel from our Department did not understand that policy, as well. So that is one area we're working on right now. We met with the amici on this. We're getting their input.

2.0

2.4

And I would like to emphasize that my plan is to meet with the amici and the public at least every six weeks to get their input. I want to know how we're doing. I want to show them our progress with the Compliance Plan, and the Compliance Bureau, and I want to get their input. Because Compliance has given us quite a bit of good ideas, and I think that we can implement it in the Implementation Unit and the Compliance Bureau. Again, Lieutenant Cori Lowe from the Compliance Division will be in charge of this area.

Our next section is develop and implement a Compliance Division policy. Lieutenant Cori Lowe will be in charge of that, as well. We are not trying to reinvent the wheel here. We also are going to talk to agencies, like I said, like New Orleans and Seattle to see what has worked for them; see if we can utilize it here; draft our policy to mirror some of the things that

were working in those areas, as well. Again, deadlines; a specific person in charge; and proof of compliance how we are meeting this plan.

2.0

2.4

Also in the Implementation Unit, we also have created a section within the Compliance Division devoted to use of force case oversight, and that's where we're talking about that Review Unit that's going to be reviewing all Level 1 uses of force. I think it's important, because we need to have an internal type of team, because Dr. Ginger has expressed that we have —because we have a process in place, and we catch our errors and we fix those and correct those. That's exactly what we need to be doing. It's not a "check the box." It's a process in place so that when I'm gone, when Lieutenant Lowe is gone, when Chief Geier is gone, these systems are here basically forever. It makes a better Police Department, changing this as a course of business.

THE COURT: Deputy Chief, we've been at it an hour and a half plus. I think you're going to be a while yet in your presentation.

MR. ERIC GARCIA: Yes.

THE COURT: Why don't we take a short break, let everybody stretch their legs a little bit. Let's be ten minutes, and we will reconvene at 3:15. And

thanks very much.

2.0

2.4

MR. ERIC GARCIA: Thank you, Your Honor.

(Recess from 3:05 p.m. until 3:31 p.m.)

COURTROOM DEPUTY JESSICA CHAVEZ: All rise.

THE COURT: Thank you, everyone. Take your seats, please.

Deputy Chief was at the stand, at the podium. We're in the midst of your presentation, please.

MR. ERIC GARCIA: Thank you, Your Honor.

I want to go into the next area, talking about the operations of the Academy. The first specific compliance issue that needs to be addressed on Number 3 was address the staffing deficiencies within the Training Academy. Dr. Ginger has noted in previous reports that the Academy was severely understaffed, and he recognized that and addressed the Court as well.

One of the big changes that was made, as was stated earlier, was Commander Sullivan was moved to the Academy, which I think is a very positive step. He has shown himself to be able to reorganize and implement a lot of these areas of the CASA, so we are expanding it to a greater scale at the Academy.

Commander Sullivan requested an increase of personnel at the Academy, and the Chief and the City have agreed to several of the items that he has

requested. A lot of it is administrative staff. A lot of it is based on his seven-step training process that he has spoken to two members of the Independent Monitoring Team, Phil Coyne and Billy Toms. They suggested that that had worked in New Jersey, the New Jersey State Police.

2.0

2.4

Commander Sullivan has implemented that; he is implementing that at the Academy. To do the seven-step process, he needs additional personnel, and that is currently being reviewed. And I was really happy to hear this week that an increase in personnel at the Academy is going to happen, because training is obviously a huge issue with the whole entire CASA.

THE COURT: Chief, let me interrupt you again.

MR. ERIC GARCIA: Yes.

THE COURT: Excuse me. But just for everyone's benefit, the Compliance Plan you're talking about was filed last night. It's Document 358. It's a far-ranging plan, progressive I think.

MR. ERIC GARCIA: Yes.

THE COURT: It was something that I had asked for when we were together in November, I guess, to address specific concerns. And it's an attachment, I think, to that Document 358 that you're going through

with us now.

2.0

2.4

MR. ERIC GARCIA: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So this is all available to the public, and you ought to study it, or you certainly can study it in more detail.

MR. ERIC GARCIA: Yes, Your Honor. And on that note, we welcome input from the public. I don't want any surprises. I'd like to work with the community to get the Compliance Plan in shape and to improve it, instead of, like in the past, the only time we hear from the Department or see anything put out would be at a status hearing. I think that's the wrong approach. I think we need to be open, transparent. And I think we need to work with the community and listen to them and implement their recommendations in this plan, and we have already started to do that.

So like I said, every six weeks, at a minimum, we want to meet with the public to get their input, and also to give them kind of a progress report on where we sit. Because I know not everything is going to be good. We are going to have good and bad. Sometimes we may not make a deadline. If we don't, I want to explain why, and I want to explain what we are going to do to correct that. So it's an ongoing process, Your Honor.

Like I said, Commander John Sullivan at the

Training Academy is in charge of the operations, is the single person responsible for that. Specific deadlines are there. He has got things off to a good start at the Academy, with that training process. I doubt we're giving him the personnel to be able to do his job efficiently.

2.0

2.4

Included in the Academy is, like I said, a seven-step training process, Your Honor. He has also developed a process to determine the transfer of knowledge, because we have to make sure that our personnel, from our line officers to our supervisors, understand the policies and understand the training, and we've got to be able to measure that they understand that. Commander Sullivan is developing a process to determine that transfer of knowledge.

Me's also working with -- he developed a modified Civilian Police Academy, CPA for Police Oversight Board, the Citizens Police Oversight Agency, and the CPC members, Community Policing Councils. And there have been a few issues, obviously, with the CPA that have been brought to our attention. Commander Sullivan is addressing them. As a matter of fact, we have reached out to set up a meeting -- hopefully tomorrow, if possible; if not, early next week -- to address their specific concerns because I don't believe

their concerns were addressed with them in the past. Or weren't addressed adequately. I'll put it that way, Your Honor.

2.0

2.4

Number 4. The fourth area of our Compliance Plan is supervisor use-of-force investigation, identifying process failures. One of the big items there is improve the Force Review Board process. We're having to revamp the Force Review Board. We have a new commander by the name of Chris George, who was the administrative lieutenant for the Force Review Board, who has now been tasked as the responsible person to identify uses of force to the Force Review Board, revamping the Force Review Board for the new process. He's also going to be creating a handbook for each member of the Force Review Board. Because, as we've seen in the past reports, the Force Review Board has been deficient.

Number 5, Your Honor, is the use-of-force training, which is a huge task. That's going to be undertaken by the APD Advanced Training, the Training Plan, between Advanced Training and the Internal Affairs Force Division, a new division we've created. So creating that, working alongside each other, will be Commander John Sullivan and Commander Rob Middleton, to ensure that we have a training plan for the use-of-force

training.

2.0

2.4

And Number 6, our amici concerns, several concerns that were brought to our attention last year, back in November, such as the McClendon subclass concerns, the CPOA and the POB members, issues with evidence.com. We're working on that. We have spoken to Director Harness from the CPOA, and we're going to be addressing his issues of concern, especially dealing with his access and his administrative rights with evidence.com.

And one thing that was brought to our attention, as well, was the Community Policing Councils. Mr. Sylvan has been doing a lot of the work himself on those. We realized quickly -- I think it was last year, actually -- that they needed a dedicated administrative support personnel. Currently, that administrative personnel that is hired shares the duties between the MHRAC, the Mental Health Response Advisory Committee, and the CPC Councils. We're going to change that.

We'll have a dedicated administrator for MHRAC, and another one specifically dedicated to assist Mr. Sylvan in his duties with the Community Policing Councils.

Like I said before, Your Honor, the Compliance
Plan is a living, working document. I want to continue
to meet with the public, the parties, and the amici. I

want to update everyone on our progress. I want to continue to gather their input.

2.0

2.4

In addition to the meeting that we're going to be having on the Citizens Police Academy, we'll also reach out to the Community Coalition to address some additional concerns that they have with use of force. That meeting is scheduled for tomorrow morning, Your Honor, and that's going to be a standard type of process with us. If the community has a question or a concern, I want to hear from them. My staff and I are going to meet with them. We'll bring in the necessary subject matter experts in that area to speak to them, to give them an explanation. If they have input in policy, anything of that sort, we want to be sure and get their input.

Also, I would like to thank Dr. Ginger. He has provided a lot of support for me and our whole Bureau effort in performing. We collaborated with Dr. Ginger on meeting our goals, objectives, and measures. As a matter of fact, he provided technical assistance to all of our project leads on Tuesday morning, I believe, at the main police station, on developmental process, so that our new stakeholders understand and our new project leads understand that we do have to develop processes. It's not a "check the box." It's a process that needs

to be put in place to address all the issues in the CASA so that these reforms stay forever, to make us a better Police Department, obviously, and work better with our community.

I think, Your Honor, we believe that so far our efforts and the efforts of the new administration and the new Mayor and the new CAO, they demonstrate our commitment to reform; and we believe, at least, it's a significant change from the past. And moving forward, I think this is the way we need to work. We need to work together with the Independent Monitoring Team, the Department of Justice, and the community, to be sure so we can meet all of our goals and, like I said, make us a better Police Department.

 $\,$  And that concludes my presentation, and I'm open for questions, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I don't have any, Deputy Chief.
Thank you very much.

Mr. Killebrew.

2.0

2.4

MR. PAUL KILLEBREW: Thank you, Your Honor.

I said a lot today about the trade-offs, and
I'm very happy to say that when it comes to this
Compliance Plan, there are no trade-offs. This is all
positive. I am just delighted. Well, there is one
trade-off, which is that Lieutenant Cori Lowe now dreams

in spreadsheet because she lives this thing.

2.0

2.4

But this document, you know, when the Court proposed this and ordered the parties to develop one, ordered APD to develop one, I think what we all hoped was that this would help us all see what APD is really doing day-to-day and hold them accountable for that.

What it has become, though, is something much better, much broader, and much more important to APD. It's becoming a true planning document. They're really thinking through carefully what are the steps that we're going to take in order to come into compliance; what order do these steps need to come in; and when are we going to get these things done. And that is the kind of thought process that we simply weren't seeing in the same way before. So I just commend them for taking the Court's order and really seeing the potential there and grabbing that potential and making something with it.

So, as the Deputy Chief said, this is a living document. This is a document that I think this entire week, when I've gone to APD for meetings, I walk into a room, and it's up on a big screen, and Lieutenant Lowe is sitting there at the typewriter, and everyone is sitting there talking about: Okay, what do we need to tweak here? What do we need to move there?

Because this is what planning looks like.

Planning is about projecting into the future, and then making adjustments as you learn more. And that's exactly what they're doing.

2.0

2.4

And so what we expect of this Compliance Plan is, yes, there was one version filed yesterday as Document 258-1, but that document is already different today, I would expect. They're going to continually be refreshing it as they make changes, as they learn more, and then updating the parties and the Court about the progress that they're making.

I wanted to clarify a couple of things about how we got to where we got on the documents filed. A couple of weeks ago, consistent with the Court's order, the City provided a draft of the Compliance Plan to DOJ and the Monitor and all the amici and stakeholders, so everyone had a chance to look at it and to give some feedback. And these three meetings that we had with stakeholders were about this Compliance Plan, as well.

There was one consistent theme from everyone in terms of feedback, which was that APD had set far too much for itself to do in the original draft. The original draft had not only all the areas of deliberate non-compliance; it also had every amici concern and all the Monitor recommendations. The original draft didn't have a deadline in there. There weren't many deadlines

that went past April, and so they were setting -proposing to do the entire case in the next couple of
months. And that, we all just recognized, was going to
be -- you know, we appreciate the ambition. But at this
point, what we think APD really needs is to be realistic
about what it can accomplish and how much time it's
going to take to do these things.

2.0

2.4

So everyone's recommendation was: Hey, let's cut down how much we're trying to take on; and with what's left, let's extend that through the next six months, all the way through the end of July.

And so the next draft that we saw, the one that was filed yesterday, it actually removed whole subject areas. So you have to look at the Compliance Plan that was filed as 358-1 along with the cover pleading that was 358, because the cover pleading identifies specific areas that were taken out of the Compliance Plan. And it's not that APD is never going to do that stuff; they just can't do it now. And that's entirely reasonable. So they're going to put those topics off for a future Compliance Plan.

Those are the things that they will start to do once they can get to them. They needed to triage and figure out the most important issues first, and they made decisions about how to triage that I think were

entirely reasonable; addressing the backlog, for example. We can't move forward without clearing out all of the pending use-of-force investigations, and they have a plan for getting that done.

2.0

2.4

There's other things that APD has been working on in response to feedback that are really important. The Monitor noted when he got the draft that APD has a lot of information on this plan, but there's some bigpicture pieces that it doesn't have, goals and objectives; the goals being, we want to clear the backlog within 12 months; the objectives being, we're going to make this amount of progress each month, and breaking it down into specific objectives.

And so APD has begun creating another document that includes these goals and these objectives. The draft that I saw earlier this week was very high quality. It reflected a lot of thinking on how to break down all that remains going forward into specific goals that link up to specific objectives. And what's really cool is that then you can link up the objectives to the tasks on the Compliance Plan, and you can say, "Wait a second. You don't have a task to meet this objective, which means you won't meet your goal."

And so then they will know that they need to go back in and figure out what tasks are going to be

necessary to meet those objectives.

2.0

2.4

So that goals and objectives document is still a work in progress, but we've encouraged the City, because once it's camera ready they should file that, as well, for the Court and the public to see so that we can, again, get a very clear picture of what they're doing.

And the other thing they have is an internal document. It's something that links all of the tasks that are in the Compliance Plan to specific requirements of the CASA. Now, that seems sort of obvious, but what's great about it is that in effect, they will be able to project their own levels of compliance into the future. They will know in six months this is where it should be, because we're going to be doing these tasks that link up to these CASA requirements.

And so then, if they can make an intelligent projection about what compliance level they should be at, they can do an assessment if they don't hit that objective, and figure out what's going wrong in their systems and what needs to be improved so that those projections are correct in the future.

So I am really excited about where they're going with the Compliance Plan. I am really excited that they're going to be reporting on the Compliance

Plan to the Court. The document suspending Paragraph 308 talks about two interim status reports that the City and the Monitor will file, and in those status reports the City will report on its progress in implementing a Compliance Plan, and they're going to tell us, and I encourage them to do so with great candor, the deadlines they're hitting and the deadlines they're missing and why they're missing deadlines, so that we can identify problems early and address them.

2.0

2.4

I'm excited to see those reports, and I do hope that the City is honest with everyone about problems that they're having. And we don't expect everything to go perfectly. As I've heard it said before, we don't expect them to be angels and be perfect; but we do expect them to be saints and be honest. That's what we're looking for from them.

I'm just going to check my notes and make sure there's nothing else. I think that's all I have on the compliance, but I'm happy to answer any questions, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I don't think so. Thank you,
Mr. Killebrew. I appreciate that.

 $$\operatorname{\textsc{Mr.}}$$  Mowrer, and then we will hear from Dr. Ginger.

MR. FREDERICK MOWRER: Thank you, Your Honor.

Very briefly. I saw you leaf through the latest version of this. To say it's ambitious is to say the least, and we stand with the Department to try to accomplish the goals laid out in this Compliance Plan because we believe that if we are successful in reaching those goals, whether we reach them at the target date or we reach them later on, it will benefit not only the citizens of this city, but it's going to benefit the employees in the Department.

Thank you.

2.0

2.4

THE COURT: Absolutely.

Dr. Ginger.

DR. JAMES GINGER: Thank you, Your Honor.

I echo the DOJ's comments on current process on planning, organizing, and moving work product at APD. The goals, objectives, and timelines process that we've talked about today were actually provided to the old APD early in its process, but this is where the rubber has started to meet the road. And what DC Garcia has laid out here today is the foundation of modern planning processes at APD, which is one of the things that in the past, in past reports, we've noted as being somewhat problematic.

So we laud APD's progress on this point, and at this point. The Planning Unit that Chief Garcia

leads has done a whole bunch of work in a very short period of time to get to the point that they now have a picture, so to speak, of what lies in front of them; some indication of which things need to be done first and which things need to be done later; and, more importantly, an ability to visually see, all right, we've got six tasks assigned to this analyst and two tasks assigned to this analyst and 14 tasks assigned to this analyst. And so now we'll be able to start to equalize workload. We'll be able to manage timelines.

2.0

2.4

And I commend them for this work. I think it's foundational for moving forward on the CASA.

THE COURT: Thank you, Dr. Ginger.

That concludes through Item Number 5 on the agenda, and we go from there to comments from the amici.

We're going to hear first from Mr. Cubra. There he is.

MR. PETER CUBRA: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Yes, sir. Of course.

MR. PETER CUBRA: Let's start with this.

There are 15,000 people who I represent each year who have mental disabilities, that go to our jails, in the McClendon lawsuit. And on behalf of all of them, thank you for sticking with this case. I get how hard that is for you. And honestly, I want to say the same thing

to Dr. Ginger. Thank you for sticking with this case, because it now has a chance of being successful.

2.0

2.4

And so it's a great pleasure to be here today, talking about what these new people are doing and the new things they are doing.

On the McClendon front, I just will do the perpetual bit of, the Settlement Agreement between us and the City has moved forward very well under the new administration. The last administration, about 37 hours before they went out of office, adopted certain standard operating procedures, based on our Settlement Agreement, in a way that rejected much of our input.

This new administration agreed to ask Judge

Parker to give them an extension of time, and the

Interim Police Chief, Mike Geier, and Deputy Chief

Garcia and the lawyers all sat with us, and just in the

last couple of days they have sent us revised standard

operating procedures that have addressed many, many of

our concerns.

It's like dealing with different people. It's like dealing with another entity. They are reasonable, thoughtful, paying attention to the community's input as we've tried to express it. And so it is night and day, the experience we are having with these people at this time.

The Chief Administrative Officer set a meeting with me days after I saw you the last time. Even before, she had it done on her own time. She did that. And then when I walked in here today, the Mayor and Mr. Lewis both walked up to me to say, "Can we have a meeting with you?"

2.0

2.4

Now, these are public servants, and they're doing it right, and it makes all the difference. And so at the highest level, Judge, I've been at this since 1984, working on system reform lawsuits. And the ones that worked all have these things in common. There is a defendant or a set of defendants who actually believe in the outcome, who are actually trying to achieve the outcome. And honestly, Judge, the other thing that makes them work is a judge who pays careful attention to the case and works very hard.

So we are situated for this case to be a success, and I just want to thank everybody involved for what they're doing.

There are some specific things I wanted to say about the process. It feels to me like the person in charge of this operation has a master's in business administration from the Harvard Business School. They are going about -- and which Tim Keller has. They are going about this in a methodical, careful, planful,

written way which allows them to be accountable to themselves and allows you to hold them accountable, and it's really great news.

2.0

2.4

Now, we talked last time about the technology of doing these cases and how a Compliance Bureau or a division or office is essential, and a Compliance Plan is vital, and they have undertaken both. In all honesty, this is happening in such a rush, I think it's premature to declare the way that they're doing some of the detail is precisely right.

Monestly, the Compliance Plan that I got this morning, and I didn't get to cross-reference with the draft that I got the other day, I'm not sure that I agree that it's a good idea to set aside certain important parts and say, "We don't have a plan at this time to address them," but to make a list of them and say, "We will make some kind of plan about these in the future."

It's what Mr. Killebrew talked about in the method. I get why you don't want a plan that has too much to do between now and July. But in a lawyerly nuance, the document that covered this Compliance Plan, Document 358, what it actually says at Page 3 is, "Where the compliance plan proves to be an effective modality for planning and executing on the requisites of reform

the following recommendations may be set out in the next compliance plan."

2.0

2.4

And so, you know, lawyers are suspicious, and so I didn't read that as a promise that there will be a future Compliance Plan, nor that these things would be set out; but rather, that they may. And so, you know, it's my role to keep an eye on both of these parties and to make sure that what happens is what they say will happen.

So for the time being, I want to say this
Compliance Plan is a good start. I think it needs to be
enhanced so that we do project out six months, twelve
months, and two years. Reasonable professionals can
disagree about whether that's the preferred methodology,
as Mr. Killebrew has stated. And I respect very much
the work he's doing here. He thinks it's best to do it
in six-month chunks, but that's not the way I've done
it, and it's not the way Judge Parker does it in his
class actions.

And so I question whether we ought to at some point soon lay out in a more accountable way the outlying obligations, even if we don't get into detail yet, and just put in placeholders that say that here's a list of nine things that we will address in July or August, and make it a commitment instead of a less than

ironclad commitment.

2.0

2.4

So that's my thought about the Compliance Plan.

And the Compliance Bureau, they picked the right person to lead it; Lieutenant Lowe is quite impressive in the way she's doing what she's doing. But it remains to be seen whether this Bureau will become effective, because they're just not there yet. They will need bodies. They will need enough hours of person power. They will need a little bit of technology in order to have these plans that they are setting out turn into a quality management system.

Because right now, we've got a bunch of good ideas and some goals and some objectives. But really, the key part of these bureaus and offices and divisions is, once you think you've accomplished something, you have a system to go back and look and see how you're doing, and then look again and look again. Because things fall apart really easily in big bureaucracies.

And so they're off to a great start. I'm not criticizing anything they are doing, but I'm just saying it's way early to know if it's going to work. And adequate resources will be essential, and I don't quite know what their resources are. I don't think they know what their resources are.

And so it's wonderful where we're at, but it could still not work if it's not adequately resourced by people who actually have some experience doing this. So don't hear that as anything negative, but it's a precautionary note that a good first step does not mean that we're going to have a good trip.

2.0

2.4

At some point they need to reduce to writing some ideas about how they're going to do it, and then disseminate it to us stakeholders, and we'll give them some feedback, and then they should have written detail. The Compliance Plan, as I understand it, does talk about that, that there's going to be a standard operating procedure.

So it could very well turn out perfectly, but we don't know yet.

The technical assistance part, I honestly was surprised by one thing that Dr. Ginger said, and that is that he thinks that he can do two tasks simultaneously, with sufficient intensity to get the job done, with the existing budget. That didn't make sense to me, because the TA that is needed and that I understand to be underway over these next six months is so substantial that they can't do their regular job. But the thought, apparently, is six months out, they will be able to continue the intense TA that's essential and do their

regular job. And so there's just an illogic, in my mind, about that.

2.0

2.4

I had thought, coming into this event today, that you would hear from Dr. Ginger that in order to do this kind of intense TA over time and to do his regular mission of monitoring and reporting, that he couldn't do it within his budget. And we all know that this City has a big budget problem, and we all know that Dr. Ginger appreciates so much that people who are really trying hard and are smart are now in charge.

But I just want to offer you my own observation. It seems like they'll be stretched very, very thinly, and perhaps beyond their ability to do both well, if they don't have any additional resources in six months. So my enormous respect for Dr. Ginger makes me loathe to say anything different than what he says, but I just have to call that ball and strike the way I see it, and I wonder. So there's that.

So I would like to know and I think many of us in the community would like to know more information about which members of the Monitoring Team are doing what with whom during this hiatus of the regular reporting. Because I have only the vaguest idea of who's doing what, and I know many of us would appreciate having a better understanding of what are the topics and

what are the tasks and who's doing it.

2.0

2.4

There's a big Monitoring Team and there are a lot of people on the defendant's side, and I don't have a feel for this elephant of what the TA looks like, and I don't think anybody among the stakeholders, who are not parties, has a good understanding of it. And we would just get comfort from having a better understanding of what we're getting during this six-month hiatus on reporting, for what that's worth for you and Dr. Ginger to consider.

So the last thing that I want to say is that you raised some questions about whether doing the technical assistance simultaneous to doing the reporting is typical, and you asked whether or not in these other police cases that's been typical, and I understood people's answers to be: It's not.

But I think I want to try and give you these words of reassurance, that in most of the class action and system reform projects I've worked on, it's very common.

Now, this is the courtroom where Judge Parker held the Jackson trial in 1988, 1989, and 1990. And here we are, still trying to reform that system. So I'm hoping things go better here than that.

But I do want to say it this way. We have

incrementally had more and more activities by Court agents. And so he uses a person who he calls the Compliance Administrator, which is more than Monitor and less than Receiver, and that person does both, gives TA on a regular basis, outside the presence of this party, with the defendants, and then sits down and gives them a report card later.

2.0

2.4

And I think it can be done, but we all have to, with an open mind and an open set of eyes, recognize there's the intrinsic tendency for people to be kinder to the people they've been nurturing than they would be if they're not nurturing them. And so I think that Dr. Ginger gets that, and I think that it's going to work out fine.

And in the prison conditions case that Judge Burciaga and Judge Conway did, the Duran Consent Decree case, the same thing. The Special Master and his consultants, they did TA and reporting. And I think it's fine, and I don't think it's going to turn into a problem.

And so that's my little presentation. Oh, I guess I did want to say this. The policy development process that has been talked about, this new SOP, I think it is probably less confusing and entangled than the last one, and I think it's highly confusing and

entangled. And so I did suggest in a letter that

Dr. Ginger ought to help them think of the way to roll

out policies that balances out efficiency and inclusion

in a better way, because I think this is still too many

cooks, and we'd like the broth to be good.

THE COURT: We would, indeed.

2.0

2.4

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$  PETER CUBRA: I appreciate you very much, and thank you for the time.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Cubra. I appreciate your help too.

When I got here a while ago, Judge Parker wasn't here. I was looking for him, my good friend and mentor. I don't get a chance to see him much. He had walked over to the jail to take a tour and meet a new administrator or something, as a part of his ongoing work in your matter.

MR. PETER CUBRA: You two have a lot in common.

THE COURT: So, Dr. Ginger, there were some questions posed by Mr. Cubra. When we conclude or when we get through with these presentations, I'll let you kind of address individual concerns as they come up. You're making notes. Good job. Thank you.

Next is Dean Mathewson and Mr. Maestas and Mr. Arellanes. And Ms. Bautista is here, as well.

I'm sorry. Would you let Julie, the court reporter, know who you are.

2.0

2.4

MR. ALFRED MATHEWSON: Yes. I'm Alfred Mathewson.

MR. ANTONIO MAESTAS: Thank you, Your Honor.

I'm Antonio Maestas.

THE COURT: And you're Mr. Arellanes?

MR. RALPH ARELLANES: Yes.

MR. ALFRED MATHEWSON: Good afternoon.

So the reset, I would say that we are pleased to see the reset, if for no other reason than the change in tone, the transparency that we are receiving, and the sense that we're being listened to. We are concerned, though, three and a half years into the process, and the community had significant trust concerns when we started, and our concern is that by starting over again, if it gets thrown out, the trust concerns will grow rather than be reduced.

One of the things that we raised back in May, that I'm not going to address, just mention, the standard operating procedure does open its process up to allow community organizations and individuals who are not represented by lawyers participate, and that's something that we were pleased to see. We still would like to see the court process be opened up, as well, and

we will have conversations with the parties between May and November to see what we come back with.

2.0

2.4

But one of the things, the reason that we are sharing our time with representatives from our organization, as lawyers, we get to speak, but we think that the Court should hear from members of the community to express their concerns and you can see the depth of the trust concerns.

In terms of the reset, one of the things, that is happening very fast, and there are lots of documents and lots of filings recently, and we are still reassessing, trying to understand them. So we'd like the reset, but we are still trying to evaluate and assess it, and part of that is in the documents.

So one of the concerns that we have on use of force dealt with the use of tasers, and we are trying to still understand this one. We can present, tell you what we do understand. And it's also true, as Chief Garcia said, we are going to meet with the parties regarding this so that we have a better understanding and see if the issues can be addressed.

But specifically in terms of the tasers, and this came up in the discussion in the meeting on March 8th dealing with the different levels of abuse in terms of the three levels now of force, the review. And the

use of tasers was a second-level review, and it took
three uses, three shots of the taser to trigger a
third-level review. Well, the tasers are weapons.

Someone has been shot. And our sense was, if you have
these different levels, to say that one shot is a second
level and three is a third level, the messaging about
how serious the use of a taser is.

2.0

2.4

The bigger issue that came up was the taser manual and whether the officers were being trained to use tasers consistent with the taser manual. And Mr. Arellanes is going to address this on a personal side, but it had to do with whether or not, as we understood it, the officers were being trained to shoot at the upper chest area. And Mr. Arellanes recalls reading a taser manual that said you shouldn't do that; you should aim the taser at a lower portion of the body.

And so we did have the manual available, and it wasn't clear that the manual had been read by those who were training the officers. And so for us, certainly Taser International has a manual for how it should be used. The training ought to be consistent with it.

I did, over the weekend, Google it and review two or three manuals over the weekend, and it does depend on the model. And I don't remember what model

APD is using, but there are instructions, and there was at least one manual which did contain one similar to what Mr. Arellanes will raise. So that's a concern. But also, the City and the parties have agreed to sit down and talk with us about this so that we can get a better understanding, to see exactly what has happened with that, and to make sure that we're on the same page.

THE COURT: Dean, when is that meeting scheduled?

2.0

2.4

MR. ALFRED MATHEWSON: We're trying to schedule it tomorrow. It was initially set for 9:00 in the morning, but I have a constitutional duty tomorrow so I can't be there, and so we're trying to reschedule it for the afternoon.

THE COURT: Well, I expect that whenever that meeting occurs, tomorrow, early or late, or early in the next week, these questions will be answered in terms of what the Academy has taught historically; what the Academy is going to teach now, if it differs; and what their manual is and what model it is.

You're going to have all of those questions answered for you at that meeting, no doubt.

MR. ALFRED MATHEWSON: So what I want to do is have Mr. Arellanes speak, again, in terms of how the community is being addressed, because this goes to the

trust issue. This is the concern. This is how it's viewed by them, and not just how it's viewed by the lawyers. Thank you.

MR. RALPH ARELLANES: Thank you. Good afternoon, Your Honor, and thank you for all your dedication to this process, and your time.

As you know, my name is Ralph Arellanes, and I'm the Executive Director for New Mexico LULAC, and I am the Chairman of the Hispano Round Table of New Mexico.

During our meeting on March the 8th, last
week, members of the amici met with the Mayor's Office,
his staff, the U.S. Department of Justice, APD brass,
City Attorneys, APD Union leadership, and many other
City officials. We were discussing the use of
electronic control devices, which are better known as
taser weapons.

THE COURT: Mr. Arellanes, forgive me. I know Ms. Goehl, the court reporter, is thinking, "I can't type this fast."

You know, when you read something, you tend to speak more quickly than when you just are not reading.

MR. RALPH ARELLANES: Okay.

THE COURT: So if you'll slow it down just a bit, it will help her.

2.0

2.4

MR. RALPH ARELLANES: With all due respect, I 1 2 will slow down, but I was given two minutes. So I'll 3 slow down. THE COURT: Oh, and so that's a built-in 4 dilemma. You know, you give him two minutes, and 5 6 you've got a lot to say. I get it. You've got to talk 7 fast. MR. RALPH ARELLANES: You gave me two minutes. 8 9 THE COURT: All right. I'll give you three 10 minutes. 11 MR. RALPH ARELLANES: Thank you, Your Honor. 12 THE COURT: Yes, sir. 13 MR. RALPH ARELLANES: I'll probably have to 14 buy one more. 15 So we were discussing the use of electronic 16 control devices, or better known as taser weapons. As 17 we were discussing use of force, I asked the question, "What part of the body do you fire your taser guns?" 18 19 Their collective response was, "We shoot for 2.0 the upper torso or upper body mass." 21 I immediately responded -- because I have a 22 lot of experience with it and a family issue with it. immediately responded, "What?" I said, "You cannot tase 23 2.4 a person above the waistline, especially with the X26

tasers, which is what APD uses."

25

I told them, "According to Taser

International's training manuals and standard operating procedures, you cannot tase a person above the waist, nor in the groin area. This is a lethal weapon that has killed thousands of people."

Then I asked all of them in the meeting, "Have any of you even read the training manuals on the proper use of taser guns from Taser International? The company spends millions every single year that you purchase your taser guns."

Their collective response was "No," they had not read the manuals. Not a single person in the room had read the standard operating procedures published by Taser International on the proper use of taser guns, even though we're sending them millions of dollars per year.

I cannot believe nor comprehend that we have been fighting this issue for over 11 years now, Your Honor; in my family, since 2007. And after millions and millions of dollars the City pays for taser weapons and lawsuits, and none of them have read the proper use-of-force procedures to apply taser weapons, mandated by Taser International, the very company they purchased their tasers from. They haven't even read them.

We are basically starting from ground zero,

Your Honor, and Mayor Keller has a very long way to go in order to fix these problems. Right now, every citizen in New Mexico is in great danger because of their incompetence and lack of training in proper use of taser guns, a weapon of human torture.

2.0

2.4

LULAC and the Hispano Round Table of New

Mexico have long advocated that the use of taser weapons
should cease immediately. The United Nations has
classified these weapons as a weapon of human torture.

At a minimum, Your Honor, the use of tasers should stop
until officers are properly trained.

Lastly, Your Honor, I have written to you before about the fact that the Albuquerque Police Department is following me and several members of my family around town. This harassment continues. Last night, they passed by my home at least a dozen times. That's intimidation. The evening of our March 8th meeting, they were shining their spotlights into my home. This is the exact same thing they did while we were going through our lawsuit against the City back in 2007 to 2010.

If they are under-manned, why do they have the time to harass citizens? They are profiling me and my family for the work we are doing through this process.

I have to believe that those present at our meeting last

week are very much aware of this conduct. We ask you for your support, Your Honor.

Thank you, Your Honor.

2.0

2.4

THE COURT: Thank you.

Deputy Chief, I'll want a response to that particular allegation later this afternoon, and certainly I'll have you address it with them at the meeting tomorrow, your official Department response.

MR. ERIC GARCIA: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. ANTONIO MAESTAS: Thank you. I'm Antonio Maestas. Thank you very much, Judge.

The amici are overjoyed with the new leadership team, the City, and the DOJ. But if I may, I want to read from the findings letter, if I may be so bold, Judge. In fact, I know we all know it, but I'll read the relevant part:

External oversight is broken and has allowed the Department to remain unaccountable to the communities it serves. Based on our investigation, we find that the Department engages in a pattern or practice of using excessive force during the course of arrests and other detentions, in violation of the Fourth Amendment of the United States.

And the seizures that were unconstitutional

ceased the life of people. People were killed.

2.0

2.4

And the findings letter goes on to say:

We reviewed all fatal shootings by officers between 2009 and 2012 and found that officers were not justified under federal law in using deadly force in the majority of those incidents.

And so we look back on 2010, 2011, 2012, where this city was, and everyone was in denial, you know.

And so the findings letter talks about:

Although a significant amount of the force we reviewed was used against persons with mental illness and in crisis, the use of excessive force by APD officers is not isolated or sporadic, and that chief among these deficiencies are the Department's failure to implement an objective and rigorous internal accountability system. Other deficiencies include incoherent implementation of community policing principles.

And so even though this stuff has definitely improved, it's our clients' opinion that these processes are not in place. And so as you recall, Judge, we represent various organizations that are involved in immigration work, community work, work with youth, work with various folks, environmental justice, and they have years and years of organizational experience and

relationships here in Albuquerque.

2.0

2.4

So what we'd ask the Court and the bodies is to -- and our paragraphs basically are 215 and 298.

215, the early intervention system, acknowledges and keeps demographic data for each officer. For each individual officer, it keeps demographic categories, for each civilian that these incidents occur with.

But when you look at 298 -- or rather, Judge, just for the record, in Paragraph 292, Subparagraph (b), it says "demographic category of complainants." I don't think "demographic category" is defined. I'm sure there's understandings amongst the parties. But when you talk about 298, use-of-force measurements, specialized units, recruitment measures, it talks about "demographic category." It just uses that word "demographic category" about five times.

What we would ask is that since we're changing the language, we use that opportunity to clarify "demographic category" and add it to the demographics of the officer, which is very easy to attain. It's not additional work that a lot of these paragraphs make the officers do. And so, for example, in the recruitment, they keep data on whether that recruit speaks Spanish; whether they have a degree; whether they came from another agency.

I think it's important for us, to truly have the best constitutional use of force in the country, that the police force have similar demographics to the communities that it serves; in particular, folks who either were born here or grew up here. And so as APD evolves, we think that keeping these steps shouldn't be a problem.

2.0

2.4

Assessment, Your Honor. The word "assess" is a Latin word that literally says "to sit beside the learner." And so what we need is innovative assessments of these things, and we've got to keep the data to have these assessments. And so even though the diligence of APD is heightened, our scrutiny and our vigorousness cannot wane, given the distrust and things of that nature.

But in closing, we're very appreciative of the new Mayor, the new Police Chief, and the folks who came out of retirement. The Deputy Chiefs are fantastic.

The City Attorney, who is committed to his client, but he's also committed to the rule of law and what you order his client to do. And we're also happy that 16 months from the new administration's election until the placement of the new U.S. Attorney for this district is finally in place.

So we think that things are going in the right

direction. We're also going to -- I don't know what

word to use -- recalibrate or regroup with regard to our

amici because we send out notices, and they come or they

don't come. We're going to reach out individually to

each of them. A lot of them are fantastic community

reorganizers, so we'll see if they want to organize

meetings and chair meetings; and then, to the extent the

City can, invite the City to those very meetings to

complement the work that the City is doing with regards

to their Community Councils.

2.0

2.4

So we'd like to hear for a couple of minutes from Maria Bautista, who has concerns she wishes to address the Court.

We want to thank the Court tremendously for allowing citizens to be involved in a civil case, which may be unprecedented, but it's because of your creativity and your leadership, and we want to thank you.

THE COURT: Ms. Bautista.

MS. MARIA BAUTISTA: Thank you. Good afternoon, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MS. MARIA BAUTISTA: My name is Maria
Bautista. I want to acknowledge first the aggrieved
families who are responsible initially for these

proceedings.

2.0

2.4

I am concerned, Your Honor, about the lack of previous oversight and sanctions by the Court and the Department of Justice regarding the Independent Monitor Reports 1 through 6. Dr. Ginger indicated on more than one occasion that there was deliberate non-compliance.

No matter how hard rank and file worked, the officers themselves were undercut by upper brass, and their retention bonuses were taken. APD was understaffed because the money available for new officers was used to balance the City budget. There were no reprimands or sanctions. In fact, there were rewards and acknowledgments, totally disregarding the Monitor's concerns of deliberate non-compliance.

On May 4th, Your Honor, 2016, Dr. Ginger informed the Court that APD was engaging in a policy of do little, delay, and deflect.

As an advocate and a stakeholder, I must trust the Court and DOJ. You are the only recourse that we have. In this instance, Your Honor, justice failed and crime escalated.

The co-conspirators included Mayor Berry, Rob
Perry, Jennifer Hernandez, Chief Eden, Deputy Chief
Huntsman, and others who participated willfully in the

deliberate obstruction of justice, and they were free,
Your Honor, to play their game and win.

2.0

2.4

We are here now in this delayed process called, quote, "a reset." This delay, after three years of hard work by all parties, is the direct result of the past administration. And they were looking for money. They conspired with one another to undermine and to obstruct the terms of the CASA agreement by covertly taping and recording the Monitor's comments during meetings with APD, and they refused to comply, Your Honor, with the Court order or even with their own SOPs or their own rules of professional conduct. Those were criminal acts, and they violated the terms of the Court-Approved Settlement Agreement, and there should have been consequences.

And that's why the amici has a hard time trusting. Our commitment is firm, and our amici support a continued process. And we do look forward to working with the new administration, and we do support Dr.

Ginger for that civility. And I hope that this Court is able to recoup some of the money that we lost over the last three years and be able to assist the process going forward.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Bautista. Thank

```
1
       you all.
 2
                  MR. RALPH ARELLANES: Thank you, Your Honor.
 3
                  THE COURT: Ms. Bautista just approached and
       handed to us -- it looks to be just her remarks written
 4
 5
       out. I'm glad for you all to see it. I didn't know
 6
       what it was. You've got it now? You all have seen
 7
       it?
                  MR. ESTEBAN AGUILAR, JR.: Yes, Your Honor.
 8
 9
                  THE COURT: Did you want to make this part of
10
       the record, Ms. Bautista?
11
                  MS. MARIA BAUTISTA: Yes, Your Honor.
12
                  THE COURT: Any objection?
13
                  MR. ESTEBAN AGUILAR, JR.: No objection.
14
                  THE COURT: We'll call it Exhibit A to
15
       today's proceedings.
                  (Exhibit A admitted.)
16
17
                  THE COURT: Let me address Ms. Bautista's
18
       concerns when we conclude today.
19
                  Now let's go to the Police Oversight Board,
2.0
       POB, and CPOA. Ms. Chelsea Van Deventer. I'm sorry.
21
       Is that a male?
22
                  MR. EDWARD HARNESS: Actually, Your Honor,
23
       it's just going to be the CPOA for both.
2.4
                  THE COURT: All right. Mr. Harness.
25
                  MR. EDWARD HARNESS: Good afternoon, Your
```

Honor. I'm here on behalf of the Police Oversight
Board and the Civilian Police Oversight Agency. I
would like to acknowledge that we do have Ms.
Van Deventer and Dr. Bill Kass here from the Oversight
Board.

2.0

2.4

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., once said, "We are not makers of history; we are made by history." And it is with that in mind that we move forward in this process. We support this stipulation presented to the Court today because it's the only way forward that makes sense to us.

There is a different climate at the Department. The ivory tower has collapsed, and we are finally being heard. The Board is thankful for the efforts of APD to file the Compliance Plan, and we are especially thankful for their streamlining and providing a Citizens Police Academy for the members of the community, of whom it is a requirement for them to do their voluntary work. The Board is glad to finally have reached a point where the Department acknowledges that it must submit CASA-related policies to the body for consideration.

However, before I portray this as all seashells and sunshine, we do have some concerns. We're concerned about the use-of-force changes from the

two-level evaluation to a three-level evaluation, and the undefined review process for the agency and the Board. It was in May of 2016 that we came to you, presenting a solution to review serious use-of-force cases and use-of-force cases, with an agreement that all cases that went to the Force Review Board would then be reviewed by the Police Oversight Board.

2.0

2.4

The current changes only contemplate a Level 3 use of force coming before the Force Review Board because they have pigeonholed serious use of force under Level 3. Yet, in the process which they are describing, Level 2 and Level 3 will go to the Force Review Board. I believe that the citizens of Albuquerque, when there is an injury to a civilian by the use of force by an officer, and it's worthy of going to the Force Review Board, I would believe that the community would want that to go to the oversight body, as well. And that is yet to be defined.

We have concerns about the use-of-force instruction. Myself and four Police Oversight Board members attended the newly abbreviated Citizens Police Academy. We spent an entire day on use of force. It was a Sunday. That training caused us concern, not only in its content, but in the delivery.

We also have concerns that we've been unable

to reach an agreement to allow the CPOA to outsource our data analysis. We've been assured that these concerns will be addressed.

So in conclusion, we will bear in mind that we are not makers of history, but we are made by history.

Thank you. Questions?

2.0

2.4

THE COURT: Mr. Harness, you have indicated that your concerns have been addressed to the new administration and they've been responsive. You talked about to what extent you were going to get to review the uses of force, just Level 3, and you felt that that was problematic; that all injuries, you said, ought to be reviewed by your agency.

And as I understood the definition laid out earlier, Level 1 didn't involve injury. So your concern is only about Level 2? Am I reading that correctly?

MR. EDWARD HARNESS: That's correct, Your
Honor. In the amendment to the Settlement Agreement
and in the stipulations, at one point serious use of
force was stricken, but then it was reinstituted. But
it was reinstituted within the three-level,
three-tiered system of evaluation, but it was still in
the context of a two-tiered system of evaluation, which
is what was in place previously.

So there is this void that needs to be flushed

out, as to whether or not Level 2 uses of force will be reviewed by the oversight body or whether it's going to be simply Level 3.

2.0

2.4

THE COURT: Someone -- maybe it was Mr. Cubra -- said earlier, "I've only seen the Compliance Plan for the last couple of hours." Because it was filed last night. In fact, after I left my office, it was filed, so I know what time it was filed. There has been what I am willing to call a really aggressive, ambitious attempt to implement a whole new strategy, a whole new approach to this process by the new administration. And at some point I'll get tired of using the "reset" metaphor.

But it's coming at us pretty fast, and even this afternoon I'm drinking through a firehose. I'm hearing a lot of stuff. I have not had a chance to matriculate it all and assimilate it all. I think we're all in that same boat. So many of the amici have said, "Yes, we're excited about the new administration, but we have concerns."

Well, we all have those concerns. I think we all share those concerns, because we wouldn't be here otherwise. A new administration and a new attitude is a great place to start, but the rubber still has to meet the road. We still have to see results, and we still

have to have constitutional policing and a safer city for our citizens.

2.0

2.4

So I echo what's been said. I'm excited about a change in tone. Gosh, you know, it may seem like a long time ago to some of you. It seems like a few days ago, to me, that we were here in November over at the Domenici courthouse and, gosh, that was a whole different day.

So it's a legitimate question you raise. I think, given what I've heard, your concerns are going to be addressed. And if you still have those concerns after you've had a chance to work through this and really dive into the detail, I want to know about it, and certainly you need to keep those concerns before me. That's all.

I'm just suggesting that we're 90 days into this administration, or whatever it is, so I think we're all pleased with the new tone, the new tenor, but we still have to see results, right?

MR. EDWARD HARNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: And as to the Compliance Plan, I haven't read it all. You know, I was driving up here today when I got it, so there's some detail to still be worked through.

MR. EDWARD HARNESS: Absolutely, Your Honor.

2.4

And I'm much more confident working with this administration and the people that are here today than who was here in November. It's just certainly these are some of the concerns that the Board has, and I'm just bringing them to your attention, and we hopefully will have them resolved the next time that we address you.

THE COURT: Gosh, I hope so. And I took it as nothing more than what you said. We have ongoing concerns, and those don't go away.

MR. EDWARD HARNESS: All right.

THE COURT: Thank you so much.

MR. EDWARD HARNESS: All right. Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Allen and Ms. Koenigsberg.

One thing I learned while I was in New Orleans, that the folks from the City who were there can bear it out, there are periodic status conferences in the other venues, the other Consent Decree cases.

But Judge Morgan said, "You let them do what? You hear from the public in these hearings?" And I said, "Yeah."

So apparently that doesn't happen everywhere.

MS. NANCY KOENIGSBERG: Good afternoon, Your Honor. And especially at this late hour, we do appreciate that the Court gives the amici and the public an opportunity to talk, and I think it proves

helpful, in contours, for you to hear that. So thank you.

THE COURT: It certainly does.

2.0

2.4

MS. NANCY KOENIGSBERG: Recognizing the lateness of the hour, I'll make my brief comments even briefer because many of them you've heard, about the overall shift in tone.

The things that APD Forward is particularly appreciative of, and Mr. Allen will address some points — we're splitting this in half on behalf of APD Forward. The ability to talk at an open process and bring concerns directly to the administration is huge. Very early on, like immediately after the first of the year, we had an opportunity to meet with Chief Geier and others in the administration. We very much appreciate Deputy Chief Garcia's interest in meeting with people every six weeks, and APD Forward is looking forward to taking him up on that as we collect information and can identify issues and pass that along.

We do also share the concerns about, even with these time frames perhaps being ambition as well, we very much want this to be the opportunity where things are done right, so that we don't have to, as a community and the police force, have to yet redo one more time.

So as the Compliance Plan rolls out, I'm

hoping that part of the assessment is whether or not the time frames are in fact realistic.

2.0

2.4

We've got these dual concerns of, we're years behind with getting an infrastructure in place that works and works well. So that will be the balance, I think, that APD Forward is going to be watching and discussing with the police. And actually, I think Mr. Mowrer had said that, as well, about if the time frame even in this Compliance Plan, which I've only glanced at, so I'm only a little step ahead of you, we're concerned about.

The suspension of Paragraph 308, again, is the same tensions, and we share the same concerns in terms of the trade-off. At this point, we're going to trust the judgment of the Department of Justice, who has weighed those trade-offs. We really agree and do want to see how this is going to work out. Since we're not going to have an IMR 7, my colleagues were in the room discussing about this 12-month look-back, that for the public to really understand and for the stakeholders to understand, that when we come to Independent Monitor Review Report 8, that we'll have a chance to see what the steps were in getting to what the conclusions were that the Monitor makes at the eighth report.

And we're going to need to look -- we will

look really closely at the status reports that are going to be turned in. Because, again, that's going to be self-reporting, and we will want some more detail, I think, in those interim reports that are given to the Court in the status reviews.

Again, we really appreciate the opportunity for real conversation and input and do have a belief that we are being listened to, and look forward to seeing continued incorporation of the public's input into the Compliance Plan and the activities. And I'll stop there. Mr. Allen will be next.

Thank you.

2.0

2.4

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.

MR. STEVEN ALLEN: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MR. STEVEN ALLEN: I just have a couple quick points to add to the ones that Ms. Koenigsberg already made on behalf of APD Forward. The first is with regard to the revisions that are being proposed to the CASA. The APD Forward completely supports the motivation behind those changes. I think we can all agree that first-line supervisors should not be wasting their time on useless bureaucratic tasks, and so anything that we can do to make their jobs simpler so

that they can spend their time to actually supervise and provide guidance to the officers under their command makes perfect sense to us.

2.0

2.4

At the same time, we need to make sure that those systems of accountability from the Department that we're still striving to create don't suffer from any changes that are made. So some of the concerns that Mr. Killebrew mentioned, we certainly share.

Mr. Harness mentioned one of the big -- you know, we're making these changes somewhat quickly. I agree with your sentiment that it feels like drinking with a firehose. The change that Mr. Harness brought up around leaving the definition of serious use of force in the CASA, how it doesn't exactly line up with these three levels of forces, is an important one.

Another one that I was just reminded of, in hearing the taser discussion earlier, is that my understanding is that a Level 2 use of force involving a taser means you deploy a taser, but that it misses. A Level 3 use of force is deploying a taser, and it hits, and using it three or more times in the same interaction over a period of 15 seconds or longer than 15 seconds. You know, if you deploy the taser twice or if you deploy it for ten seconds, it's not clear that it fits into either of those levels.

So some of those details, we agree, still need to be worked on, as far as we could assess.

2.0

2.4

The other point I wanted to bring up was around policy development. We're very excited to see an effort to bring the Police Oversight Board more into this process. That's a fundamental part of the POB's mission, so we think that's important. That, again, is a work in progress. We agree with Mr. Peter Cubra's comments that anything that we can do to simplify that and clarify that for the public -- I have a hard time explaining in my own mind how all these different pieces fit together.

I think if we want members of the public to engage in that process, if they sort of care about how their Police Department operates, it's going to be hard to figure out, to explain to them how to plug into that system. And for that reason, you know, there is still some work to be done there. But it is exciting to see.

Ms. Koenigsberg, right before this meeting, pointed out that we are going to need a new Mobile Crisis Team policy that's developed over the next year or so, and to see that work through these different pieces I think is — it's going to be an exciting way to test the process and see how it's working.

To close, we echo what everyone said. Happy

to see this incredible new tone. It does seem like night and day to us. After three years of obstruction and playing games, it finally feels like the adults are in the room. We are very happy, Your Honor, to hear that you'll stay on the case and that Dr. Ginger will stay on the case. We do believe this is a recipe for success.

We are very optimistic about the future of this reform process, and APD Forward is eager to collaborate and play a constructive role in that process. And we just thank you that we have the opportunity to do that, because we do understand that that's not always the case with these other Consent Decree processes that are occurring in these other communities.

Thank you.

2.0

2.4

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Allen.

And to all of the amici, you're telling me today that you've got access, maybe that you haven't had before, and you feel like your voices are being heard like they haven't been before. I expect that you will continue to closely oversee this process and give the feedback that's critically important to DOJ, to the City, to APD. And if you at some point feel like that access is being touted and not actually given, then I

want to hear about that, too.

2.0

2.4

Let's see where we are. Mr. Sylvan on behalf of the Community Policing Councils.

MR. CHRIS SYLVAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MR. CHRIS SYLVAN: My name is Chris Sylvan.

I'm the Community Policing Councils Manager. I also
wear another hat. I'm the Community Outreach Manager
for APD. So I have dual roles now for APD.

And before I forget, I'd like to say that there are two CPC members who are here. One is going to speak. Her name is Dorothy Woodward. She is with the Northeast CPC. Rod Kontny -- I'm not going to pronounce his name right -- is also here. He's the Chair of the Foothills CPC. Rowan Wymark is the Chair of the Valley CPC.

So anyway, today I'm supposed to talk about what my role is with the CPCs. I am the Manager of the CPCs, and what I do is give them administrative support. One of the things I needed to do was address the confusion about what APD's role is with the CPCs, and we want to engage in a meaningful way while respecting the individual entities of the CPCs. So basically, the CPCs are individual entities; but at the same time, you know,

they need some help administratively, and that's why Mayor Keller appointed me to this position.

2.0

2.4

out.

We want the CPC members to know that we want to hear from them and their recommendations are important. And because of this, I've set up a weekly meeting with the Chief, and we're going to go over those recommendations on a weekly basis.

One of the things I've done since I've joined -- excuse me -- since I've been appointed to this position is, I've streamlined the recommendation process. I've looked at it. It was very clunky. And this process will now have a flow. I even showed Dr. Ginger what the process looks like. I mapped it out. He enjoyed it because mapping out a process --

MR. CHRIS SYLVAN: Yes. And I found that

THE COURT: Because he likes maps.

So I guess the other thing I'm supposed to talk about is ways the administration is re-engaging the CPCs, and I will fold in not only the CPCs, but I also will fold in the Community Outreach. We are undergoing an aggressive social media campaign. We're getting ready to hire a social media manager to do better outreach. Right now, our outreach is not as good as it could be, but it's going to get better just because

we'll have somebody dedicated to that.

2.0

2.4

We're also reaching out to under-represented communities. I personally have been to meetings with the Chief and the Deputy Chief, Deputy Chief Medina, to different organizations that they haven't attended to in the past. We have an electronic billboard campaign, apparently, underway. I don't know if you can see that here, but this is what went up on the billboard. It says, "Help Protect ABQ's Youth. Join A #CPC Today." So that's one of the ways that we're trying to increase membership and also attendance.

THE COURT: And how does that contrast with previous outreach, if there was?

MR. CHRIS SYLVAN: Since I'm new to the position, I'm not sure how to answer that question, Your Honor, but I'm hoping that with new eyes and with the aggressive campaign that I'm doing -- previously, I was working for Councilor Gibson, and I know you've seen her in these courtrooms before. She's the Councilor for District 7.

And I know that you really have to be aggressive with outreach. So moving forward, we will also be advertising on Spanish-language radio stations soon. I'm going to be doing an interview on GOV TV.

That's our cable access channel. And that will give us

something to go on the road to talk about what CPCs are and different things in APD.

1 1

2.0

2.4

Because of these things that are in place and going to be in place, applications are up since I've taken the job in January, mid January. One of these days, I'd like one of my CPC Chairs to come up to me, back to the Spanish-language radio station advertisement, come up to me and say, "Hey, we need a Spanish-language interpreter."

I want to have a good problem like that. I also want to have a good problem where we need a signer or any other interpreter.

As far as recommendations go, recently the Foothills put out a recommendation. They were concerned about auto theft. We worked with the Albuquerque Journal to have the auto theft prevention tips published in last Sunday's Journal. This was a recommendation that came out of the CPCs -- excuse me -- the Foothills CPC, I think in February, and it's already implemented.

We're also creating a comprehensive public information campaign to go along with efforts to target auto theft throughout the city. That's another part that came out of the Foothills recommendation.

One of the other highlights that's come out of the CPCs is the Northeast CPC's request for a shortened

```
1
       Citizens Police Academy, and that has actually been in
 2
       place. In fact, several of our members went through it
 3
       a couple of weeks ago. That recommendation came on
       board before -- that recommendation was put in before I
 4
       started.
 5
                  Other recommendations have been --
 6
 7
                  THE COURT: Excuse me. What's the length of
       the Academy now?
 8
                  MR. CHRIS SYLVAN: It's two weekends. And I
 9
10
       believe it was -- six weeks?
11
                  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Twelve weeks.
12
                 MR. CHRIS SYLVAN: Thank you. Twelve weeks.
13
                  THE COURT: And it's how many hours over two
14
       weekends?
15
                  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Two days a week, three
16
       hours per night, is what we were doing before. I'm
17
       sorry. I'm sorry, Your Honor.
18
                  THE COURT: And I'm interested to know now.
19
       It's two weekends, you say?
2.0
                  MR. CHRIS SYLVAN: Right.
21
                  THE COURT: How many hours? Can anybody tell
       me that, how many hours that is over two weekends?
22
23
                 MR. ERIC GARCIA: Your Honor, I believe it's
2.4
       32 hours, eight hours each day.
25
                  THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
```

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$  CHRIS SYLVAN: And the POB members also were at that shortened Academy.

2.0

2.4

Another highlight that I want to point out that the Valley CPC implemented, and this was before I took this position, they implemented — they requested bike patrols, and bike patrols have been put in place.

The Southeast also mentored -- the Southeast put in a proposal for a mentor program for APD recruits, and that was put into place.

And the Southwest put a response to verify the injury accidents.

That was another thing that the CPCs have done in the past. Because I know that you have heard about the CPCs, but I'm not sure if you've heard what the recommendations and what the processes have been and how the recommendations have been implemented.

So NYPD leaders visited Albuquerque a few weeks ago, and they left a strong message, in my mind, and I think this applies to CPCs. Officers shouldn't strive to police the community. The goal should be to reduce crime, hand-in-hand with the community. And I hope that that's what we can achieve with the CPCs.

THE COURT: Thank you, and thank you for -- well, congratulations on your promotion or whatever it was.

1 MR. CHRIS SYLVAN: It was a promotion. 2 THE COURT: Thanks. Thanks very much and 3 congratulations. I appreciate your service. Was there someone else that was going to 4 speak, one of the CPCs? 5 MS. DOROTHY WOODWARD: Good afternoon, Your 6 7 Honor. THE COURT: Good afternoon. 8 9 MS. DOROTHY WOODWARD: And thank you for the 10 comments about this building. Forty-nine years ago, I 11 stood here and raised my right hand to protect the 12 Constitution and joined the military. This is my home 13 town, and I knew this building very, very well for a 14 long time. It is remarkable. Thank you for your 15 comments. 16 THE COURT: I love it. And I brought my CRD 17 and my law clerk. They'd never seen it before. We got 18 here early so we could tour the building, and it really 19 is a treasure. 2.0 MS. DOROTHY WOODWARD: It is. Soak it up. 21 I'm here today because our chairperson, Eric 22 Olivas, cannot be with us, and he has asked me to impart these words on behalf of our Council. 23

Eric says: I believe I speak for many when we say that the new administration offers CPCs and our

2.4

25

community at large a breath of fresh air. While Mayor
Keller and Chief Geier have been on the job only a few
months, we have closely observed their priority to place
community policing for support groups like CPCs which
aim to further community involvement. We have seen an
uptick in that engagement and increased interest in
police policy and reform. For example, in January at
our meeting, Chief Geier was our guest speaker, and
Deputy Chief Garcia.

I like them.

2.0

2.4

THE COURT: There you go.

MS. DOROTHY WOODWARD: We had 80 members of the community participate. The dialogue was positive and productive. The future of Community Policing Councils appears bright in this city, especially now that we have new APD leadership, and we look forward to further grow a productive relationship.

That said, it is our hope that the new administration will continue with this support, while at the same time engaging CPCs in meaningful ways. For the spirit of the Settlement Agreement to outlive this document, groups like CPCs and POBs must be empowered and interwoven into the fabric of policy and decision-making at APD. We look forward to a healthy relationship with APD, knowing there exists other

1 challenges before us, some of which we have stated here 2 in your Court, Your Honor. 3 Thank you. THE COURT: Yes, ma'am. Thank you. 4 MS. DOROTHY WOODWARD: Do you have any 5 6 questions? 7 THE COURT: No, ma'am. MS. DOROTHY WOODWARD: Okay. Again, I'm not 8 9 shy. Some of the gentlemen at these tables will tell 10 you, I've already let them know where I'm coming from. 11 I'm watching. Elizabeth knows, too. 12 THE COURT: I believe you are. 13 MS. DOROTHY WOODWARD: And Ed Harness. MR. ROD KONTNY: Again, I'm Rod Kontny. I am 14 15 chair of the Foothills CPC. I will tell you that 16 spending 30 years in the Air Force logistics did not 17 prepare me for this job, because it is unique, and I'm 18 starting to enjoy it. 19 I did go through that Civilian Police Academy, 2.0 the short view. It was four days, eight hours each day. 21 The eight hours on use of force was pretty grueling. I 22 will tell you that. 23 So at any rate, I just want to say a few

things about that the CPCs are very important because it

allows the citizens to ask, or sometimes confront the

2.4

25

police officers who are there, and the police officers then give them their opinions or their actions or the regulations and so forth. And that's very helpful, very frankly.

2.0

2.4

And the other thing is, of course, the recommendations. And we put that one in about how to protect your vehicle, and Chief Geier acted on it right away, got me up there. I've never gotten an e-mail from a Chief before, so that was kind of interesting. And so we had a meeting in his office, and we concluded, and some good things came out of it, and they're working on other things.

I want to say, shortly, one other thing, and that is, I go on ride-alongs. Last year, I went on one and I had the opportunity to talk to some police officers, guys that are in the squad cars, and the sergeants and the commanders. I never got above that. But it was very interesting, talking to these young officers, and that they did in fact embrace the CASA. They thought the CASA was a good thing. They didn't like some of the things that APD was implementing to make them do certain things, and they were very upset about that. But recently, I've been talking to some of them, and they have a different attitude now, and I think it all comes from the new administration.

So at the very level that some of you don't get to, where you talk to police officers on the street, or the sergeants, or maybe the lieutenant, and I can do that, and I find it very encouraging, as everybody does within the administration.

So that's all I have.

2.0

2.4

THE COURT: Thanks very much. Thank you.

You know, you're volunteers and nobody pays you to do

this. You don't do it for the glory, I suppose. So

you do it because you love your community and you want

to make it a better place, and I appreciate that. I

think we all do. And I am glad that we've got some

folks that aren't shy in those positions.

Thank you very much.

MR. ROD KONTNY: Okay. Thank you.

THE COURT: And Mr. Whatley is following you.

MR. DANNY WHATLEY: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$  DANNY WHATLEY: I'll make this very short.

First, Your Honor, I want to thank you for the opportunity to speak, but also that the MHRAC has been provided copies of the stipulations and the Compliance Plan, and we're in total agreement with that and the motivation for that. We certainly see it is something

that will move the CASA along.

2.0

2.4

As you're aware, the MHRAC responsibilities as spelled out in the CASA have us dealing with those interacting with law enforcement that are in mental health crisis, and are also maybe experiencing homelessness.

And with that, again, with the CASA outlining those things, we created three subcommittees — training, resource sharing or information sharing, and resources, and those three subcommittees continue to work with APD. And when the Mayor was speaking, he talked about the Department looking at the CASA, at the letter and the spirit.

And I'm here to assure you that the CIU and the folks that we've dealt with have always had the spirit of the CASA. They've always looked at it as being a change in attitude, a change in direction for law enforcement in our city. And I think that was from their leadership. Chief Garcia was primarily responsible for that.

But one of the successes that we have had has been in the area of training. I was in law enforcement for 33 years, and during that time we sort of ran away from civilian interference or relationships with civilian instructors in our Academy. APD has now turned

and gone in the opposite direction.

2.0

2.4

And we just had a CIT training, a Crisis
Intervention Training session, the first of March, and
18 hours of that 40-hour training was conducted by MHRAC
membership, so they're bringing in the MHRAC expertise
that's within that committee. And 17 hours of that
40-hour class was provided by non-law enforcement
professionals in our community. And, again, that is -I think Chief Garcia is certainly responsible for that,
to see that change.

But the CIU has been one of those that has become the professionals in dealing with those and dealing with mental health crisis. As I think Dr. Ginger will tell you and the Department of Justice will tell you, they've become very impressive, in fact, traveling all over the United States, teaching that model that they're using here.

In the old days, we used to look at the Memphis model, and I truly believe that in the future it will be the Albuquerque model because of the guys and the folks that are involved in this training.

And the APD officers and the civilians within that division, within CIU, have made that a very professional way to deal with folks. They're working in the homeless community. We're seeing more and more

homeless that are experiencing and involved in mental health crisis, and we are seeing the change in officers as they interact with those experiencing that crisis and how they deal with the people that are doing that. But they're not only dealing with the individuals in crisis, but they're dealing with their families and they're dealing with the community in general.

When we started the MHRAC years ago now, we had two goals in mind. One was to provide law enforcement with the training and the policies and everything that they needed to safely do their job, safely for everybody involved. But the second part of that was so that we might could instill in our community the trust and faith in our officers here in Albuquerque. And I think even though we've got a long way to go, we're going in the right direction. And we look forward to working with the new administration and the new command staff at APD.

Thanks, Judge.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Whatley. Thank you for what you do. I think that concludes the comments from the amici.

The final item on the agenda is an update on CASA-related community engagement.

Ms. Martinez.

2.0

2.4

MS. ELIZABETH MARTINEZ: Thank you, Your Honor.

2.0

2.4

As you know, Judge, Mayor Keller took office on December 1st of last year, and his first order of business was to appoint Chief Geier to lead APD. Today is March 15th, and so Mayor Keller and Chief Geier have been on the job for 104 days. That's only 75 weekdays, so they've actually been on the job only 15 weeks. They've accomplished a great deal in a very short period of time.

Today, they've talked about three very significant documents here. They've talked about two documents that are setting the path for the way forward, and Deputy Chief Garcia has talked about a pretty comprehensive Compliance Plan. And together, these three documents are setting the infrastructure to put APD back on track to come to full and complete compliance with the CASA.

And this has been a real heavy lift for the entire Department, but particularly Chief Geier, Deputy Chief Garcia, Lieutenant Lowe, the folks that are working with them, and folks like Commander Sullivan, certainly Assistant City Attorney Jeramy Schmehl. These folks have been working tirelessly, virtually around the clock, and they deserve tremendous credit for a

tremendous amount of work, and I am -- we are all just amazed at how much work has gone on.

2.0

2.4

And one of the things that is remarkable in all of this is that while all of this has been going on, the community engagement also has been moving forward. It hasn't been ignored. As you've learned, Deputy Chief Garcia has made sure that they have been reaching out to the amici and to the key stakeholders throughout this process to make sure that they're getting regular input, to make sure that they're being as transparent as they possibly can. And they've made commitment to the community to continue to have that transparency and that collaboration out there.

We applaud that, because that's how the City and APD is going to establish that relationship of trust that is critical to have APD be successful. Because unless we have APD re-establish that relationship of trust, even if they meet every single element of the CASA, without trust we're just not going to be successful. So we applaud all of these efforts that APD and the City is making to reach out to the community, to work with the community, to re-establish that critical trust with our community.

I want to also commend the City and APD for the work that they have been doing with the CPCs.

You've heard about the work that the Academy did in terms of revamping the CPAs so that they could accommodate the CPCs and the Police Oversight Board, the condensed CPAs. I actually participated in that condensed Academy also. And, as Mr. Harness commented, there were some concerns voiced by participants on the use-of-force instruction, and that critique was raised with the City and with APD, and the response immediately was, "Bring it to the table. Let's discuss it. We will address those concerns." And, in fact, we expect to have those meetings as early as tomorrow.

2.0

2.4

So that is the response we're getting these days from the City and from APD. It is an immediate reaction. It's very much the same kind of response that the Community Coalition and Mr. Arellanes got when they raised a concern about the taser and the manual. And that is the reaction we're getting from the new administration, and it's all very positive, and it's a very lovely change.

In terms of the community engagement, you've heard from Mr. Sylvan and you heard from some members of the CPC earlier today. One of the things that they didn't mention is that last night, Mr. Harness and the CPOA hosted the sixth CPC summit. The Mayor was at the summit last night, and this was, as I said, the sixth

CPC summit. It is the first time that the Mayor, a Mayor, has attended a CPC summit. And the Mayor addressed the summit, he engaged with all of the CPC Chairmen. And I'm also delighted to report that it is the first time that the Chief of Police also participated in a summit. And I think that speaks to the value that our Mayor and our Police Chief place in the role that the community has in this process.

2.0

2.4

One of the things that members of the community have raised with us and have raised in some of the meetings we had last week and this week is the fact that they have not had the community meetings that they got used to having since 2012, when DOJ began its investigation into APD. You may recall that when we initiated our investigation, DOJ started having community meetings to keep the community informed about the investigation. When we announced our findings, we also had community meetings to inform the community. We continued having those meetings when Dr. Ginger released his reports.

And we ceased having those meetings when the former City Attorney indicated that she believed that the City should take that responsibility. We agreed with that view because we did think that that was a responsibility that the City should assume. But the

City did not step forward. So in 2017, those meetings did not occur.

2.0

2.4

We have a new member of the City
administration who has a very rich history of working
with the community and dealing with community
engagement, Mr. James Lewis. He and I have had some
discussion about this, and I know that he is going to be
working in this area. We anticipate that the City will
be reengaging with the community in this area and will
go back to engaging with the community at large.

I believe that we have discussed in these proceedings with this Court, with our community, that Albuquerque has been unique amongst communities that have Consent Decrees. Our community has demanded to be kept informed. Our community has insisted that they know what is going on with our process and has insisted that the Department of Justice, that the City of Albuquerque, that APD, and that this Court keep them informed of what is going on.

And all of us greatly appreciate that you have included the community, the amici, the stakeholders in this process, and we are very appreciative of the fact that the Mayor has brought Mr. Lewis on into this unique role and that he will be part of keeping the community engaged in this process.

Thank you, Judge. Unless you have any questions, I will relinquish the floor to, I think, Deputy Chief Medina.

2.0

2.4

MR. HAROLD MEDINA: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My name is Deputy Chief Harold Medina, with the Albuquerque Police Department. I retired in 2014, and I returned back to the Police Department recently with the new administration.

My focus is community policing. I think that we need to understand community policing, and we need to make sure that we move forward with the three principles of community policing, not established by me, but established by the COPS Office, and that is community partnerships, problem solving, and transparency in the Department.

And as you stated earlier, the proof is where the rubber meets the road. And I will be brief on some of the projects that we've already started, but I think that the cornerstone of the Albuquerque Police

Department gaining legitimacy within the community again is the rebuilding of trust within the community. And the rebuilding of trust within the community goes beyond community engagement with meetings about the CASA. It goes into the principles of developing relationships with the community.

And historically, the Albuquerque Police

Department had relationships with the community at the

Neighborhood Association level, and you had a commander

and lieutenant who attended all of these meetings, and
they had great relationships, and everybody in the

community knew who the commander and lieutenant were.

But there is one thing I promise you that was a fault in that system, is when that person's car got broken into at 6:00 in the morning, the commander and the lieutenant are not the ones that are taking the police report.

So what we're trying to do is, we're trying to shift the focus from the relationship being built with the upper command staff, to the relationship with the community being built with the officers, and that we spread out from the concept of just meeting and community engagement with Neighborhood Associations.

We've already met. We've established a series of Coffee with a Cop that were pushed forward by neighborhood organizations. I think we have a total of 26 that are going to be occurring in the next month or so in the various area commands. I think 12 are already scheduled, to my knowledge.

We are also reaching out for youth engagement. We will have our first Youth Coffee with a Cop at

La Cueva High School on the 22nd.

2.0

2.4

And I think that all of these are just ways for us to engage the community. We have already begun planning Junior Police Academies, no longer at the Police Academy at APD, but we're taking them to the Community Centers at each area command, and our goal is to have that first positive experience with youth and police officers so that it's in a positive way, not in a negative way.

I think that as we move forward, it's important to recognize that we have been in office 15 weeks, we've been here, and we've already made a lot of commitments and we've already taken a lot of steps to develop a lot of this community engagement. But the last piece of community policing, I think, is what we all have to remember takes time, and that's transformation of a Police Department.

And this reform process has to be beyond checking a box that we're engaged with the community. It also includes changing the perception of our officers and how they view the public and how they interact with the public and ensuring that they recognize that they're public servants and that's what they're here for.

And in a way, Commander Sullivan has a large task there of assuring that every police officer who

1 comes out of the Police Department from this day forward 2 recognizes that they're public servants, and that we install that belief in them as a core value in the 3 Police Academy. 4 And like I stated earlier, I'll be brief. 5 6 It's about where the rubber meets the road, and those 7 are just small samples of a lot of the programs that we're already planning and implementing to interact and 8 9 to help rebuild that bond of trust with the community. 10 Thank you. 11 THE COURT: Yes, sir. Thank you. And I'm 12 sorry. Your rank? 13 MR. HAROLD MEDINA: Deputy Chief. THE COURT: Deputy Chief, forgive me. Your 14 15 name is Harold Medina? 16 MR. HAROLD MEDINA: Yes. 17 THE COURT: Do you know that you have a tocayo, a famous judge named Harold Medina? 18 19 MR. HAROLD MEDINA: Yes, I know that. 2.0 Somebody once told me that, and I think he was out of New York. 21 22 THE COURT: He was, and he was a great man, 23 and a good study for you to see what your heritage is

MR. HAROLD MEDINA: Thank you.

2.4

25

in terms of your name.

1 THE COURT: Yes, sir. Thank you. 2 Oh, I just always try and, you know, add a 3 little something. Mr. Mowrer. 4 5 MR. FREDERICK MOWRER: Your Honor, in the lateness of the hour, APOA has no comment on this 6 7 subject. THE COURT: It occurs to me, we might start 8 9 these meetings at 5:00, and maybe they would be wrapped 10 up more quickly. 11 Mr. Schmehl, you're on the agenda for this 12 issue, or Mr. Aguilar. 13 MR. JERAMY SCHMEHL: Deputy Chief Medina took 14 care of it. 15 THE COURT: Okay. Great. 16 And Dr. Ginger. 17 DR. JAMES GINGER: Yes, sir. Thank you, Your 18 Honor. I'm keenly aware that protocol requires me to 19 face the Court when I'm addressing you, speaking, so 2.0 I'll apologize in advance for turning my back on the 21 amici who have been up here before. But I only get in 22 trouble with the Judge, so --THE COURT: You know what? If you'd rather 23 24 face that way, that's fine with me, except Ms. Goehl --

25

well, we've got a mic here.

DR. JAMES GINGER: We could do this. Let's see if this works.

CRD JESSICA CHAVEZ: Here's a microphone.

DR. JAMES GINGER: Okay. That will work. I was just trying to avoid contempt, Your Honor.

THE COURT: As you should.

DR. JAMES GINGER: Always a wise choice.

THE COURT: Good call.

2.0

2.4

DR. JAMES GINGER: As the amici were speaking, I was taking copious notes, none of which I'll be able to read, but I'll try to get through them.

Mr. Cubra had some issues and questions about the reset period and where's the report that reflects progress or not, in lieu of doing the direct technical assistance. We have done technical assistance since Day One. We've done nothing but technical assistance since Monday here, right now. It comes in many forms. Most of us think of it as consulting trips.

And we've spent a great deal of time with DC Garcia and his folks and Jeramy Schmehl and other folks with APD this week, talking about the reset and where we plan to go. Other members of the Monitoring Team will follow in on that. Their purposes is twofold. One is to collect data that continues to inform me of APD's progress on this project; and the second is to provide

needed technical assistance.

2.0

2.4

I don't think anyone familiar with the last two and a half or three years would argue the fact that -- and I do this a lot lately; I talk about the old APD and the new APD. I don't think anyone who is familiar with the old APD would suggest they didn't require technical assistance. And I don't think anyone familiar with the new APD doesn't understand that they will go out of their way to ask for, listen to, and respond to technical assistance. And if I've gotten anything this week, I've gotten that message.

More directly to Mr. Cubra's point, a couple of things. We're reducing the reporting workload this time, so our reports will be much more succinct and much more summary related than being the monstrosities they usually are, 400 to 500 pages.

That serves a couple of purposes. First, it gives the new APD a chance to catch its breath, get its feet on the ground, huddle together, and make its plans for moving forward. And that's intentional. I designed that intentionally because I wanted to avoid them showing up for work on Monday morning and being faced with a list of staccato demands by a Monitoring Team for "what have we done recently about," which is our usual process.

So I think with this process, we'll be able to avoid the one thing I hate most of all in managing a project, which is asking for more money. I really hate to do that, and I've done everything I can do not to foist that off on the citizens of Albuquerque.

2.0

2.4

And secondly, with the intense interactions that we're having with APD personnel, Chief Garcia and Lieutenant Lowe are going to be sick of me by the time I leave Friday. But that's okay. I hope we've given them enough technical assistance to get to a running start on jump-starting their Compliance Bureau. When I leave, we're available by phone seven days a week. Often, sometimes, maybe, we work on Saturdays. And if need be, we will.

DC Garcia has known all along, from Day One, that that has always been the case. And one of the reasons he got his units in compliance faster than anybody else was, he took advantage of it. He didn't mind asking us questions while we were here on-site, and he didn't mind making phone calls to my subject matter experts to ask questions and get clarifications. And that's why his units were among the very first to roll into compliance.

So we've got a twofold approach on this site visit that is different from the other site visits.

We're collecting less data. We're asking more pointed questions to determine whether or not processes are in place, that should be in place, as opposed to asking for 50 reams of paper or five electronic disks for data that we can go through and say, "Okay, this one is dated February, this one is dated March, this one is dated April," which is what we do. And that's, as you can imagine, very painstaking and labor intensive.

2.0

2.4

So the proposal I made to the parties was to throttle back a little on data collection and analysis this reporting period, throttle up on technical assistance, and still give the Court and the Albuquerque citizens an understanding of our assessment of APD's compliance status for this period of time. And that's what those two interim reports are for.

So you'll get a little bit of both. It will give my team and I time to give whatever technical assistance APD needs, requests within reason -- within reason -- and get them restarted, and get them to where we think they should have been, hopefully by the end of the next reporting period. They're not going to start from zero to 110, either. I hope. You know, the process would militate against it.

I didn't tell you these notes were legible, so bear with me for a second.

For the LULAC group, Mr. Arellanes and Dean Mathewson, I had already encountered the issue that Mr. Arellanes raised in the parties' meeting -- was it last week? I'm losing track of time. I immediately, when that issue came up, sent out to the parties and to APD operational personnel the current taser operating manuals. And obviously, they already had in their possession the current policies here.

2.0

2.4

We're in the process of going through the two of those things, and I can tell you right now from my initial review -- we haven't completed it -- but from my initial review, APD policy and training is compliant with taser documentation. Now, that's not finished. We have a few more stones to turn over to make sure whether or not that's the case. But we were on that process the day Mr. Arellanes raised the issue, and I hope -- in fact, I know -- that some folks at APD will use that same model in community relations and questions from the community.

But we're not finished yet. We've got to get APD's responses, and we've already gotten some from the Union, and we'll put a final packet together. But everyone who is on the mailing list for that meeting got a copy of those policies for tasers. And those are the latest we could find; we couldn't find any after that.

So you have the very latest that I know Taser has put out, and we're working on that process.

2.0

2.4

The UNM folks who asked about demographic data. We've been familiar with that issue for quite some time. In fact, the last site visit, I spent some time with Dean Mathewson discussing that. My guess, Dean, is that you'll find the new APD a little more receptive to those issues and the needs of the community. If you don't, sir, please let me know, and I'll try to work through with Chief Geier and some of his people a reasonable response to your reasonable requests.

I think I spent the better part of an hour and a half in your office the last time we met with the Dean and other folks from UNM, talking about this issue and potential solutions to it. And I think if we reboot that question, we might find some different answers right now. So if we can try that, I'd be happy to try to facilitate it if you'd like. I know you're not shy, but if you'd like me to participate, I will.

There's a note here that I just simply can't read, so I apologize.

For Director Harness with CPOA, Ed and I are both former police officers, so we tend to be on the same wavelength a lot of the time. He has some

legitimate concerns about recommendations from CPOA that go to the Chief for actualization or decision-making.

And, again, those reservations were well-founded.

Again, I think you'll find a different audience with the new APD in town, so to speak. I think Ed is still here.

Yes, there he is. There's a glare; I can't see you.

Sorry. I think you will find a different reception. If you don't, then let's sit down and talk about it, and we'll see where we can go from there.

2.0

2.4

I only took 16 pages of notes. Be patient.

Regarding the Force Review Board issues, those issues raised were cogent, well presented, and correct.

We have the same issues. The Monitoring Team has the same issues. So we'll be working with Chief Garcia,

Chief Geier, and his folks, to ensure that the new Force Review Board is, I would hope, a model for the industry; and if not a model for the industry, then certainly congruent and compliant with the current best practices.

That's an issue we have on our radar, probably not the site visit. We're still trying to get the car started again, and that sometimes requires a lot of attention. But it's on the agenda, and we look forward to working with APD to get that moved forward. I don't think any of you who read our reports think that we think the FRB process is a good one. I spent a lot of

ink and a lot of paper talking about the FRB process.

2.0

2.4

So I forget who this comment came from, but you and I are in agreement. We need to reconfigure it.

We're in the process now of thinking about that among my team and myself, and the next site visit, after this one, we'll be in the process of assisting, as much as we can, getting APD up and running on revisions to that process.

One thing I wanted to do -- I think everybody understands it; but if not, I'm going to say it again. There will be no routine, normal IMR 7. We'll be using the money that we usually spend writing that 500-page document in providing technical assistance and training to APD to jump start their new processes. So you'll get two mini reports instead. We have to keep the Court informed what it is we're doing; and how we're doing it; and what kind of reception we're getting at APD; and mistakes that we've made; and that sort of thing. So those two reports will be used for those purposes. There will not be a normal IMR 7, and that's where the money comes from to do this reboot, the technical assistance reboot.

I've failed the Court again. I took a note and I can read it, but I don't understand what it meant. I apologize. APD Forward. Where are you guys? You and

I need to talk, because this is your note. So I don't know -- I know what the words say, but I don't know what they mean, so I'd like to revisit your concerns.

2.0

2.4

And I believe this is for APD Forward, as well, but I think you guys know that the Monitoring Team is not an easy Monitoring Team. We're aware of your issues and your concerns. We get them addressed by APD when we can, which some time ago wasn't all that successful. But I think, again, with the new APD, I'm finding the door is open, the lights are on, people are engaged, and they are deathly aware of the timelines that come in on their work. So if that doesn't change, I'll note for you, if it doesn't, then we need to sit down again like we've done before and develop some strategies. But I think you'll be pleasantly relieved at what you get out of this new group.

The issues of Level 1, Level 2, and Level 3 uses of force, I think we're all painfully aware that that's a soft spot in this reboot. I flow-charted it, turned it upside down and in 14 different directions, trying to find fatal flaws with it. I found some flaws, but I don't think I found any fatal ones. I think this will work. And the thing I like about it is, it does what I told APD from Day One. It puts more sergeants' time on the street. And that's the only way out of this

Settlement Agreement, is effective supervision.

2.0

2.4

So we'll be monitoring for that. There will be things that come up that the Chief and I need to discuss in terms of what kind of monitoring processes they might want to set to work. My goal with that is that this becomes the internal Monitoring Team, we're the external Monitoring Team, and that we become simpatico about what our definitions are, what our concerns are, what our processes are, so that when we leave, you still have your Monitor; just a different set of folks.

 $\label{eq:formula} \mbox{For the CPC folks, Ms. Woodward and Mr.}$   $\mbox{Kontny -- did I get that right?}$ 

MR. ROD KONTNY: Yes, sir.

DR. JAMES GINGER: Good. I don't know how you guys feel, but I know for a fact that this new APD group wants you vibrant and active, and they want your input. I've already seen evidence of that, and I think probably you have, too.

MS. DOROTHY WOODWARD: Yes.

DR. JAMES GINGER: So I wholeheartedly agree with your assessment of the way things used to be, and I wholeheartedly agree with your disagreement about those things. But this is a new bunch. I think you guys are going to be pretty happy.

But look at the meeting -- was it last night?

Look at the meeting last night, compared to meetings a month or a year ago, and you see a huge difference. The Mayor was there. You know, that should tell us something. The Mayor. To my knowledge, the Mayor had never been to a CPC meeting under the old administration. So hang on. Change-is-a-coming, as they say.

2.0

2.4

Danny Whatley and his crew, Nancy, are you still here? Yes, there you are. Okay. You guys had the same concerns that we had. With the new leadership, I think you'll see a difference. If not, the same applies. If you don't see it, let us know, and we'll start working the drums again. I know the folks who are in charge of that process, and I know the new expertise that comes from Chief Geier and the new focus that comes from Chief Geier, and I would expect in the very near future that you guys are going to be probably getting asked more questions and asked for more input than you're able to provide.

But I've done a lot of future projection here tonight, so I hope everyone's aware of that. The proof is in the pudding, as the old saying goes, and the Monitoring Team here will be here as of IMR 8 in the same way, reporting what's good, what's bad, and what's

indifferent. And we won't go anywhere until DOJ says
we're done. That's right. Until DOJ encourages the
Judge and influences the Judge to believe that -THE COURT: We're not done until I say we're
done.

DR. JAMES GINGER: We're not done until the
Judge says we're done, folks. Sorry, Your Honor.

2.0

2.4

 $\label{eq:As you can tell, the process, sometimes I} % \begin{center} \begin{center} As you can tell, the process, sometimes I \\ \end{center} % \begin{center} \begin{cen$ 

I know it's late, but if there are any questions, I'll be happy to try to address them.

Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Dr. Ginger, thank you.

The hour, it's getting late, and I've got a bit of a drive still, so I won't take but a moment. One discrete issue, Deputy Chief, Mr. Arellanes talked about a couple of things, but one was personal harassment ongoing at his home and 12 cruise-bys, I would like you to look into that for me. You can address it now if you'd like, or get your facts together, however you want to handle it.

MR. ERIC GARCIA: Your Honor, I agree. Those are serious allegations, and I'm going to be requesting an investigation into that. That kind of behavior will not be tolerated. So, yes, I'll be requesting an

investigation into that, and I will be getting back to Mr. Arellanes, as well.

2.0

2.4

THE COURT: Please do. And keep me posted, maybe on a monthly basis, a 30-day basis or something. I'd like to know what the result of your investigation is, and we'll go there from. All right?

MR. ERIC GARCIA: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Thank you. Thank you for your commitment.

Another discrete issue. Ms. Bautista is concerned, as I'm sure we all are, and certainly the taxpayers of the city of Albuquerque are, about a perceived spinning of wheels over the last couple of years and not making the progress that we all coveted. You talked in terms of looking back and recriminations against prior administrations. And frankly, that's not my job.

And if I wasn't attentive enough to that process and I didn't require of the City and the Department what I should have, as the overseer of this process, that's on me, and I'm sorry. I tried to address things as I was aware of them, and sometimes pretty publicly.

But whether any action is taken relative to them, that's not my job. That's somebody else. You

talked about criminal conduct. I'm not addressing that, I'm not going to comment on that, and that's the prosecutors' job, and if the prosecutors want to do something, that's their business. And probably that's going to be the last I'm going to say about that, because it's a new day and we have limited resources, and I don't want resources, limited as they are, directed backward-looking when we've got a lot of work to do yet going forward.

2.0

2.4

And I began today by telling you about my meeting with the Mayor and the Chief and the Deputy Chief, and the DOJ. I came away from that meeting as upbeat and even excited about this process as I have been throughout. And if you remember, we had a barbecue in this room because we had a good report in the midst of several bad ones, and I thought we ought to celebrate. I mean, it doesn't take much to get me excited in this process.

So I genuinely am hopeful. And you know what? We all know that verbalizing an intention is a nice thing, but it's only that. You know, you have to have commitment associated with that. And whatever the math was, 104 days, we've already seen some commitment in terms of resources being expended, new hires, a new Compliance Bureau being stood up.

When I was in Ft. Worth, hearing about that, about what New Orleans had in place and anticipate leaving in place after the Judge says they're done, I thought: Gosh, that's bound to be an expensive proposition.

2.0

2.4

And I know Albuquerque is struggling with their budget. Everybody is. But that has been very public in the last few months. I thought: Can I order that? Can I require that of someone, you know, of the City?

I get the Compliance Plan, and there's a
Bureau stood up, and I didn't have to say a word. And
that's commitment that backs up the Mayor's suggestion
that he owns this result. So I'm pleased about that,
and I am hopeful. And do we have a long road to travel
yet? Absolutely, we do.

I've heard "rubber hitting the road" and "the proof is in the pudding" and, you know, I can throw another one in there, "a 10,000 mile journey starts with a single step."

And damn, you know, we should have been further along after three years. I get it. I know that to be true. But we are where we are, and we're not standing still anymore. We're moving. So I'm pleased for the commitment that I've heard from the City.

The DOJ is not going anywhere, and they're going to continue to monitor the process, as is our Independent Monitor.

2.0

2.4

And one of the things I took away from the thing in Ft. Worth: How do you make reform stick? That was one of the questions that was asked: How do you make it stick?

And one of the great answers, intuitive as it is: Make reforms that nobody wants to reverse; that the next administration wouldn't dare reverse; a Compliance Bureau that is doing the ongoing work of a Monitor for years to come; and making sure that they're policing the police themselves; and it works; and trust is restored.

And these are good things, and who's going to tear that apart? Who's going to stand that down? You know, the folks wouldn't stand for it. You create a system that is going to resist change. It sounds like that's what they have in mind.

everyone's participation, and I look forward to -- well, I don't think the schedule anticipates that I'll be back in this sort of forum until November. That's right, isn't it? I'm not getting any love here. Gosh, you know, I've forgotten that. But I'm watching every day, and I am in contact with these folks on a regular basis,

and we're not going anywhere until we've got this right, 1 2 and we've made a good step in that direction. 3 So thank you very much for your presentations. Mr. Aguilar. 4 MR. ESTEBAN AGUILAR, JR.: Your Honor, before 5 we adjourn, may I approach? 6 THE COURT: Yes. 7 MR. ESTEBAN AGUILAR, JR.: I would like to 8 9 provide the Court with a copy of the org charts that 10 Mayor Keller had asked me for. The first one, for the 11 record, is the organizational chart as it existed on --12 as it currently exists, but this was updated on 13 February 23, 2018. The ladder on the back page is the 14 2017 organizational chart, updated November 1, 2107. 15 Thank you, Your Honor. 16 THE COURT: And without objection, I presume? 17 I'm glad to make this a part of the record, as well. 18 (Organizational charts admitted.) 19 THE COURT: Anybody else? Ms. Martinez. 2.0 MS. ELIZABETH MARTINEZ: Yes, Your Honor. 21 I just want to make sure that the community 22 knows that the United States is ordering the transcript 23 of this proceedings on an expedited basis so that we can 2.4 make sure that the community has the transcript as soon

as we can get it to them. We try to make sure that we

25

keep everyone informed on the proceedings in this case. Thank you so much. THE COURT: Yes, ma'am. And I made the point earlier, perhaps not well, but the three documents that we talked a lot about today, they are public record. They've all been filed and are all available on PACER and, I suppose, maybe on the City's website; I don't know. But they certainly are available to the public. And unless there's anything else, thanks very much. We're adjourned. (Proceedings concluded at 5:50 p.m.) 

CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER

I, Julie Goehl, RDR, CRR, RPR, RMR, New Mexico CCR #95, Federal Official Realtime Court Reporter, in and for the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico, do hereby certify that pursuant to Section 753, Title 28, United States Code, that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the stenographically reported proceedings held in the above-entitled matter and that the transcript page format is in conformance with the regulations of the Judicial Conference of the United States.

Dated this 20th day of March, 2018.

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

## JULIE GOEHL

FEDERAL OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER Registered Diplomate Reporter Registered Professional Reporter Registered Merit Reporter Certified Realtime Reporter NM Certified Court Reporter #95 333 Lomas Boulevard, Northwest Albuquerque, New Mexico Phone: (505)348-2209

Email: Julie\_Goehl@nmcourt.fed.us